

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. 403.—APRIL, 1905.

Art. I.—LORD DUFFERIN.

The Life of the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava. By the
Right Hon. Sir Alfred Lyall. Two volumes. London:
Murray, 1905.

By an unusually happy choice Sir Alfred Lyall was selected to write the life of Lord Dufferin. Sir Alfred occupied a high position in India during the period of Lord Dufferin's Viceroyalty; he returned home, in the same year as his chief, to fill a place of still greater influence in the India Office. In India he had an opportunity of observing on the spot the manner in which Lord Dufferin discharged the duties of the highest office which, in his varied career, he was called on to fill. In England Sir Alfred has had exceptional means of acquiring a knowledge of our policy in the East, with which Lord Dufferin, in the Lebanon, at St Petersburg, at Constantinople, and in India itself, had so much to do. But, if long and varied experience in India, and on the Indian Council, enables Sir Alfred to speak with exceptional authority on those portions of Lord Dufferin's life which made his name familiar to his contemporaries, and will ensure his remembrance by posterity, other qualifications also specially fitted him for the task. A poet of no mean order, a writer whose works are always original, a critic whose judgment is almost always sound, Sir Alfred is admirably constituted to appreciate a man who was not merely a distinguished administrator and diplomatist, but who inherited through his mother the genius of the Sheridans. A few of Sir Alfred's readers may, indeed, think that he might have devoted, with advantage, a little more space to some passages in Lord Dufferin's life.

Six or seven hundred pages are a small allowance for the biography of a man who filled so many important positions. But, in these days of diffuse biographies, we are not disposed to quarrel with a writer who has contrived to be concise without becoming obscure. Sir Alfred Lyall has been fortunate in his subject, and Lord Dufferin in his biographer.

And what a life it was which Sir Alfred Lyall has undertaken to write! Most administrators would consider themselves fortunate if they had crowned a long career by presiding over the destinies of our great autonomous colony in America, or by administering the affairs of our vast and populous dependency in India. Most diplomatists would regard themselves as equally fortunate if they had been entrusted, before their final retirement from the service, with our diplomacy at one of the great European capitals. But Lord Dufferin represented his sovereign in Canada and India, at St Petersburg, at Constantinople, at Paris, and at Rome. No other man who lived in the nineteenth century filled so many high and important offices, or filled them with more credit to himself or with more advantage to the country.

He commenced life, no doubt, in favouring circumstances. Heir to a great estate and to a considerable name, he was introduced to official life, and was even raised to the English peerage, at an age when most men are painfully endeavouring to secure a foothold on the lower rungs of the professional or parliamentary ladder. He leapt into prominence. But he owed his advancement, not merely to accidents of birth and fortune, but to qualities which commended him to his political leaders, and made him the favourite of society. He was born at Florence on June 21, 1826. His father, Price Blackwood, a naval officer who succeeded somewhat unexpectedly to the Irish peerage, died while his only child was a boy at Eton. His mother, Helen Sheridan—one of three famous sisters, who became respectively Duchess of Somerset, Mrs Norton, and Lady Dufferin—was the granddaughter of Richard Brinsley Sheridan. She said herself to Mr Disraeli: 'You see Georgy (the Duchess of Somerset) is the beauty; Carry (Mrs Norton) is the wit; and I ought to be the good one, but then I am not.' Her verdict on herself, however, is not likely to be shared by many

people. Those who look on her portrait will think that she inherited much of the beauty with which her grandmother, Miss Linley, endowed her family; those who read her poetry or her correspondence will give her credit for the wit and genius which distinguished her grandfather; while those who read her letters to her son will think that, whether she was or was not 'the good one,' she was among the wisest and best of mothers. She sent her boy, in the first instance, to a private school at Hampton, removing him in due course, in May 1839, to Eton, where she placed him with Cookesley, 'a tutor who' (Sir Alfred Lyall says) 'had more brains than ballast; whom his pupils liked much more than they respected him; who could make himself popular, but could not make them work.' Admitting that Cookesley's eccentricities made him an unsuitable tutor for many boys, we cannot fully endorse this judgment; nor are we sure that we could not apply Sir Alfred's indictment of Cookesley to other masters who were at Eton at the same time. It is, at any rate, the case that Sir Alfred himself quotes Sir James Stephen's description of life at Eton to justify his remarks on life at Cookesley's. We think he might have recollected that an Eton pupil-room, like other institutions, is to be judged by its results, and that something, at any rate, can be said for a master whose pupil-room contained, when Lord Dufferin was at Eton, a future Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, and was soon afterwards to admit another distinguished diplomatist, Sir E. Malet.

Blackwood's talk was so copious that Cookesley nicknamed him 'the orator'—Cookesley had a nickname for most of his pupils; but his oratorical powers do not seem to have gained him admittance to the debating society, profanely known as 'Pop,' where many generations of boys, from the days of Mr Gladstone downwards, have anticipated their triumphs at the Union or in the Senate. But the fact was that Lord Dufferin's temperament hardly fitted him for the distinctions at which most public-schoolboys aim. When he went up to Christ Church, one of his contemporaries said of him that he 'neither hunted, nor rowed, nor played games, and his immediate friends were not many.' At Oxford he seems to have pursued the somewhat detached life which he

had followed at Eton. He did not seek such honours as the university confers in its schools, or the undergraduates themselves award on the cricket field or on the river. Shunning the company of the many, he surrounded himself with a few chosen friends, with some of whom he founded the Pythic Club. He justified, however, his old tutor's nickname by taking frequent part in the discussions of the club and in the debates of the Union, whose president he ultimately became.

Lord Dufferin remained at Oxford for only two years, which he afterwards remembered as 'the happiest of his unmarried existence.' In 1849 he accepted from Lord John Russell a Lordship-in-waiting, and in the following year was raised to the English peerage as Lord Clandeboye of Clandeboye. He resigned his court office on the fall of Lord John's administration in February 1852; but he found ample means of occupying his time with the distractions of society, the duties of his estate, and the interests of foreign travel. In 1854, after the commencement of the Crimean War, he took his yacht, the 'Foam,' to the Baltic, and witnessed the siege of Bomarsund from her decks.

'When Sir Charles Napier asked him whether he had a wish to see a shot pass over him, Lord Dufferin closed with the proposal and went on board the "Penelope," a ship that was ordered to run within range of a Russian battery, for the purpose of ascertaining whether it was effectively armed. The "Penelope" not only drew the enemy's fire, but her crew were so busy watching the shots that she was not stopped before she grounded on a rock, and Lord Dufferin passed two hours in perilous exposure. . . . Not content, however, with this trial of his nerves, Lord Dufferin joined a party to visit the trenches of the French army investing Bomarsund. . . . They slipped across from battery to battery, running the gauntlet of fire in the open intervals; and finally, seeing a white flag hoisted on the fort, they walked straight up to the gate, were sharply ordered back by a Russian officer who cried to them that the place had not yet surrendered, and regained cover under a satisfactory shower of balls and bullets.'

Lord Dufferin's adventure probably raised him in the opinion of his political chief, who, more than forty years before, had ridden with Lord Wellington along the lines

of Torres Vedras; and, in the spring of 1855, Lord John asked his young follower to join him on his abortive mission to Vienna. Lord Dufferin thus obtained his first introduction to diplomacy and diplomatists; but he apparently omitted to place on record any of the impressions which he derived from his mission. He returned home to occupy himself with the duties of his court office, which he had resumed under Lord Aberdeen, and with the affairs of his Irish estate, which he was never tired of improving. But attendance at court and alterations at Clandeboyne could not satisfy his adventurous nature.

'Like Ulysses, Lord Dufferin could not rest from travel, and heard the call of the sea. So in June 1856 he set off "to sail beyond the sunset" into the Arctic north on his yacht the "Foam," with a bronze likeness of the Dukes of Argyll, by Marochetti, as her figurehead. The story of the voyage has been brilliantly told in his "Letters from High Latitudes," a book which shows him in the prime of his manhood captivating the Icelandic ladies by his lively courtesy, taking frolics and fatigues with equal zest, never flinching before the deep potations of the hospitable Norsemen or among the fogs and icebergs which barred his access to Spitzbergen.'

In the winter of 1858-9, in company with his mother—and having substituted steam for sails—he took another voyage in quieter waters, visiting Egypt, Syria, and Greece. This leisurely expedition occupied the whole of 1859; and he only reached London in the beginning of 1860. The turning-point of his life had come; he was about to hear a more serious 'call' than that which had summoned him to the frozen waters of the North or the blue skies of the Mediterranean. A great duty was imposed on him, which forced him hurriedly to return to the Levant, where he had passed so much time in the preceding year.

The district of Syria lying between the mountain ranges of Lebanon, or Anti-Lebanon, and the coast, is mainly populated on the north by the Maronites, an ancient Christian sect, and on the south by the Druses, a race of Mahomedan schismatics. Each of these was placed under a local chieftain, subordinate to the Turkish Governor of Syria. Hereditary feuds had long existed between the two peoples, who hated one another as the Guelfs hated the Ghibellines, or the Montagues the Capulets. The Turkish

government unhappily encouraged dissensions which it was its business to allay; and in April 1860 the feud broke out in bloodshed and fire. The Druses attacked the Maronites; the Maronites retaliated on the Druses; the Turkish garrison, instead of repressing disorder, joined in the slaughter. In the course of May thirty-two villages were burned down; and Lord Dufferin himself found in Damascus 'upwards of 2000 houses utterly destroyed, and their inhabitants buried beneath their ruins.'

When news of these ghastly outrages reached western Europe they excited a thrill of horror. France has always regarded herself as the protector of the Roman Church in the Levant; and Napoleon III, much to his credit, at once proposed that the great Powers should send a joint commission to Syria, and that the commission should be followed by French troops, instructed to restore order. The proposal was received with some coldness by this country. The Emperor's Italian policy, and the proposed annexation of Savoy and Nice to France, were exciting distrust; and, though French and British soldiers were again acting together in the Far East, there was no longer any real cordiality between the two peoples and their rulers. Accounts, however, of further massacres compelled Lord Palmerston to assent to the Emperor's proposal; and Lord Dufferin was selected to represent this country on the joint commission.

If there was no real cordiality between France and England, there was some divergence between their views. The French, as the special patrons of the Maronites, were disposed to lay the entire blame of the massacre on the Druses; the English, on the contrary, as a great Mahomedan power, were inclined to regard both Druses and Maronites as equally guilty. While there was this divergence in their views, there was also a difference in their aims. France, despatching 8000 troops to Syria, desired that her own soldiers should win credit in restoring order. England, on the contrary, nervous of any fresh symptom of French aggression, was anxious to secure the withdrawal of the troops on the earliest opportunity. The French desired to place the whole district under a Maronite chief; the English, or Lord Dufferin, suggested that it should be turned into an in-

dependent Viceroyalty on the Egyptian model. The compromise which was finally adopted was to place it

‘under a Christian governor nominated by, and directly subordinate to, the Porte, . . . unconnected with the tribes and a stranger to the province, to be appointed for three years, and to be removable only on formal proof of misconduct.’

It may be possible to argue that Lord Dufferin’s own proposal would have afforded a more radical and more complete remedy for Syrian disorder than the compromise which the commissioners adopted. But the latter, at any rate, succeeded; and Lord Dufferin had the satisfaction of hearing, some years afterwards, from a correspondent at Damascus that the settlement was still a success. ‘There is no province in Syria, none, I believe, in the Empire, so well governed as the Lebanon.’

In fact, in the melancholy history of the Ottoman Empire during the last fifty years, the shadow is relieved by the single ray of light thrown upon it in 1860 and 1861. For once the Concert of Europe had been made to work; and that it was made to work was largely due to Lord Dufferin’s tact, ability, and good manners. He won the confidence, not only of the wretched people whom he had come to protect, but of his fellow-commissioners whom he had so often to oppose. As his mother wrote,

‘His departure from Beyrout was a universal sorrow: rich and poor, merchants, sailors, and soldiers—everybody seemed to love and look up to him; and he was tenderly kissed on both cheeks by the French general, his principal political adversary.’

We have dwelt at some length on Sir Alfred Lyall’s admirable account of the mission to the Lebanon,* because it was not merely the turning-point of Lord Dufferin’s career, but in some respects was the most successful piece of work which he ever accomplished. But we must pass over more rapidly the succeeding seven or eight years of Lord Dufferin’s life. During these years, indeed, he was introduced to official duties at home, having

* Sir Alfred has had the good sense to consult, and to master, the French view of the case; and, in consequence, he writes, throughout his chapter on the Syrian mission, with an impartiality and knowledge which unhappily are not always shared by other English writers on the subject.

accepted the under-secretaryship at the India Office. During these years he lost the mother who—so he wrote himself—‘was one of the sweetest, most beautiful, most accomplished, wittiest, most loving, and lovable human beings that ever walked upon the earth.’ During the same period he married the lady who still survives, and to whom he was able to say, in the last year of his life, ‘You have been everything to me in my prosperous days, and they have been many; and now you are even more to me in my adversity.’ But, with such exceptions, there is little to chronicle between his return from Syria and his appointment to Canada. His duties at the India Office, at the War Office—to which he was transferred in 1866—and at the Duchy of Lancaster—to which he was appointed in 1869—however largely such work may loom in the lives of other men, count for nothing in a career so full and varied as that of Lord Dufferin.

During this period, however, he was engaged in his chief political controversy. The recrudescence of rebellion in Ireland drew new attention to Irish questions. Mr Gladstone commenced his task of attacking the three branches of the famous upas tree; and men like Mr Mill and Mr Bright formulated rival schemes for dealing with Irish land. Lord Dufferin, in 1868, entered into the lists against Mr Mill; and perhaps the few surviving persons who have read their respective pamphlets will form the conclusion that he got the better of the contest. The part which he had taken in the controversy, and his position and experience as a great Irish landlord, naturally induced Mr Gladstone to consult him when he was preparing the Irish Land Act of 1870; and traces of Lord Dufferin’s advice may be found in the measure itself, and still more clearly in the speech with which Mr Gladstone introduced it in the House of Commons. Yet Lord Dufferin was, in fact, radically opposed to the ideas which were inspiring Mr Gladstone, and which were, indeed, permeating political society at that time. For, while almost every reformer on both sides of the House thought it necessary to give the Irish tenant some greater interest in his holding, Lord Dufferin was in favour of gradually abolishing the interest which custom had given to the Ulster tenantry. The legislation which Mr Gladstone initiated in 1870, moreover, tended to create a dual ownership in land,

while Lord Dufferin's whole policy was based on vesting the landlord with complete control of his own property.

In so writing we have no desire to reflect on Lord Dufferin's conduct in the management of his estates. On the contrary, from the day on which he came of age—at a period when many large Irish proprietors were unhappily neglecting their duties and living away from their property—he was impressed with a sense of his responsibilities as a great landlord. His first act, on attaining his majority, was to grant his tenants (Sir A. Lyall says rather imprudently) an abatement of 2000*l.* a year of his rental for twenty-one years. He was able to say in 1870 that leases had been the ancient rule on his property, and that there was not a tenant at will on his estate. Further, with a lavish generosity worthy of the Sheridans, he spent, in twenty-five years, some 150,000*l.* on improvements; and more than half of this sum was devoted to the benefit of his tenants, whose rental, notwithstanding, was not increased by a single sixpence. His prodigal liberality in this respect partly contributed to the embarrassments of his closing years; for it was a desire to restore the noble fortune which he had seriously impaired that induced him to undertake duties in the City for which temperament and training equally disqualified him. But, if Lord Dufferin must be regarded as a model Irish landlord, he signally failed to appreciate the real difficulties of the Irish land question. His own excellences blinded him to the misconduct of some landed proprietors; and, though he was induced to support the Act of 1870, which for the first time invested the Ulster custom with the sanction of law, he defended it

'for the same reason that I would sentence the murderer of an illegitimate infant to be hanged. I do not approve of adultery; but the creature being there has the right to the protection of the law.'

It is not altogether surprising to learn that ministerial silence indicated disapproval of these sentiments, or that Lord Dufferin, conscious of the difference between himself and his colleagues, thought it right to offer to retire from the Government. It is perhaps not much more surprising that, in the few years which followed the Act of 1870, he sold two thirds of his Irish estates. He was, of course, strongly opposed to the Act of 1881.

Mr Gladstone and his colleagues had no desire to lose their brilliant lieutenant; but some of them were already considering whether other and more suitable work could not be found for him. On Lord Mayo's assassination in 1872, the Duke of Argyll, as Secretary of State for India, evidently desired to confer the Viceroyalty upon him. The Cabinet, however, preferred Lord Northbrook; but immediately afterwards decided on sending Lord Dufferin to Canada as Governor-general. The prize was undoubtedly a great one. By an Act of 1867 'the four provinces of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick had been united under the name of the Dominion of Canada.' The territory of Manitoba, purchased from the Hudson's Bay Company, had been added to the Dominion in 1869; British Columbia and Vancouver's Island joined the confederation in 1871, the year preceding Lord Dufferin's appointment. He was therefore the first Governor-general who ruled over the vast territory of British North America, from the shores of the Atlantic to the shores of the Pacific ocean. The experiment of confederation was first tried in its integrity under his auspices.

The political matters, indeed, which occupied much of Lord Dufferin's time in Canada need not detain us for many sentences. The allegations of corruption which ultimately destroyed Sir John Macdonald's Government, and led to the formation of Mr Mackenzie's Ministry and the trial and pardon of Lepine,* who had been accessory to the murder of an Englishman named Scott, raised

* Two constitutional questions were raised on these matters which perhaps deserve notice. (1) Sir John Macdonald was forced to assent to the appointment of a parliamentary committee to enquire into the allegations of corruption, and to a Bill empowering the committee to examine witnesses on oath. Lord Dufferin, we think rightly, gave his assent to the Bill, which was, however, disallowed by the Home Government as *ultra vires*. We very much doubt whether the Home Government would have so acted twenty years afterwards. (2) The execution of Lepine's sentence would have excited so much opposition among the French Canadians that Lord Dufferin obtained authority from the Colonial Office to commute it 'in consultation with his ministers.' Lord Dufferin commuted the sentence but dispensed with his ministers' advice, and the Colonial Office approved his conduct, but gave instructions to prevent a repetition of it. We are inclined to think that the Colonial Office was wrong. The commutation of a sentence for a crime associated with party politics is one of the few things which a constitutional governor may, and perhaps ought, to take upon himself to do.

issues, difficult and delicate at the time, which have long since been consigned to the lumber-room of history. The true service which Lord Dufferin rendered in Canada was that he impressed on the Canadians the value of their connexion with the mother-country; and that he taught the people of the United Kingdom to estimate at its worth the importance of their great transatlantic dominion. It must be recollected that the year in which Lord Dufferin went to Canada was the year which followed the treaty of Washington; that, in the negotiations which had preceded the treaty, American statesmen had hinted that the true solution of the dispute lay in the cession of Canada to the United States; and that, if American authorities are accurate, the suggestion had not been repudiated with any warmth by the British minister at Washington. It must also be remembered that one of the foremost members of the British Cabinet, Mr Lowe, had actually told Lord Dufferin that he ought to make it his 'business to get rid of the Dominion.' It may safely be said that, when Lord Dufferin returned home, some six years afterwards, no British statesman of either party would have ventured to give such a hint.

This change of thought may no doubt be attributed to other causes, but it was largely assisted by Lord Dufferin's conduct. In the first place, the Queen had never been represented in Canada with anything approaching the pomp with which Lord Dufferin invested his office. He gave splendid balls and magnificent dinners; his expenditure was so lavish that the Duke of Argyll declared that people were saying that he would be 'entirely ruined.' Nor was it only the splendour with which he surrounded his office that ensured his popularity. Wherever they went, Lady Dufferin and he were the centre of society; and the Governor-general was holding levees, patronising Lacrosse matches, attending university convocations, receiving addresses on all possible occasions, and delivering happy impromptu replies. The magic of his presence disarmed opposition; and the town which, on his entrance, showed neither interest nor curiosity, turned out its whole population to display their appreciation of him on his departure. But Lord Dufferin did more than this. His restless love of travel carried him through the length and breadth of the vast Dominion,

exploring its great lakes, investigating the capabilities of its still unoccupied territories, and threading its 'interminable labyrinth of watery lanes and reaches' on the Pacific coast, which promised endless 'facilities for inter-communication for the future inhabitants of this wonderful region.' Other travellers, after the fatigues of such a journey, accomplished without the luxuries of modern travel, might have been disposed to rest. Lord Dufferin's enthusiasm impelled him to communicate to others what he had seen. His eloquent language taught the Canadians themselves for the first time the value of the great territories which British enterprise and British statesmanship had secured to them. His words, brought home to England, impressed the British people with new ideas of the vast heritage which their fathers had been led to regard as a useless encumbrance. Thenceforward there was no more talk of cession or independence.

After six years' residence in Canada Lord Dufferin, not unnaturally, desired some rest at home. As a matter of fact he hardly reached England before Lord Beaconsfield proposed to him a new and difficult duty. Russia, in 1879, was brooding over the decisions of the Congress of Berlin, which had deprived her of some fruits which she had hoped to gather from the war with Turkey. She was concurrently pushing forward her advanced posts in Central Asia, and already occupying positions which British statesmen thought the safety of India required to be in neutral keeping. Questions of the utmost delicacy, therefore, awaited solution; and Lord Dufferin was well qualified to deal with them. We do not gather, however, from Sir A. Lyall's pages, whether any real progress towards an agreement was made during Lord Dufferin's stay at St Petersburg. He was certainly in close communication with the ministers at home. Though he only reached St Petersburg in March 1879, he was in England in the following May. He returned to London in August, and he was specially detained by Lord Salisbury, and not allowed to leave England till the following December. We confess we should have liked to ascertain, from so competent an authority as Sir A. Lyall, something of what passed between Lord Salisbury and Lord Dufferin. We long for a little seasonable indiscretion. But Sir A. Lyall, instead of satisfying our

curiosity, merely gives us a picture of Lord Dufferin's 'Sheridanish' liberality, which turned the British embassy into a court, and made Lady Dufferin and himself 'the most charming and popular diplomatists who had ever been at St Petersburg.' This brilliant picture, indeed, is enclosed in a dark setting. Lord Dufferin had not been two months in Russia when he had to report how the Emperor, 'walking in the square before his palace, was met by a respectably dressed man, who saluted him, stepped aside, and fired several shots' at him; in the following February an attempt was made 'to blow up the Emperor's apartments'; in March Count Melikoff, who had been invested with unlimited executive authority, was fired at and wounded; and finally, in March 1881, the fatal bomb was thrown which terminated the Emperor's life.

At this time, Mr Gladstone's Government, which had succeeded to power the year before, had decided on transferring Lord Dufferin from St Petersburg to Constantinople. Sir Alfred again is provokingly discreet; and we get no indication of the reasons which suggested the transfer at a time when difficult and delicate negotiations were in progress at the Russian Court. It is probable, however, that Mr Gladstone's Government may have concluded that the disorganisation of the Ottoman Empire and the failure of the Sultan to carry out the reforms in Asia which he had promised Lord Beaconsfield to effect, necessitated the appointment of the strongest available man to the Porte, and even suggested the nomination of the statesman who, twenty years before, had done such good service in the Lebanon. At any rate, in the beginning of 1881, Lord Dufferin was hurriedly transferred from St Petersburg to Constantinople, from an atmosphere charged with Nihilism and conspiracy to 'the turbid and chaotic politics of the Osmanli Empire.' It is hardly necessary to say that he failed to introduce any real order into the Sultan's affairs. The apathy of the Porte and the indifference of all his diplomatic colleagues would, in any case, have deprived him of any prospects of success. But, as a matter of fact, his attention was almost immediately diverted from the affairs of Turkey to the affairs of Egypt; for the deposition of Ismail Pasha, and the installation of Prince Tewfik in his stead, paved the way for the military revolt

under Arabi which led, directly or indirectly, to the bombardment of Alexandria and to the campaign of Tel-el-Kebir; and Mr Gladstone's Government, which had drifted into a position of considerable difficulty, decided on sending Lord Dufferin to Egypt to enquire into and report upon the whole situation.

The task which was thus set him we may at once say was impracticable. The work of replacing chaos by order, whether it is undertaken in a great country or a great department, requires above all else time; and time was the one thing which the British Cabinet was not disposed to grant. It was anxious—and no doubt it had good diplomatic reason for its anxiety—to withdraw from Egypt at the earliest possible opportunity; and Lord Granville sent despatch after despatch to his agent asking for his immediate opinion on various subjects. Lord Dufferin very sensibly asked this minister in a hurry to allow him breathing time. But he so far complied with the wishes of his employers that he actually made his final report within three months of his arrival at Cairo. This report foreshadowed 'the creation, within certain prudent limits, of representative institutions, of municipal and communal self-government, and of a political existence untrammelled by external importunity, though aided, indeed, as it must be for a time, by sympathetic advice and assistance.' Representative institutions Lord Dufferin proposed to found by allowing village constituencies to elect members of provincial councils, which councils were in their turn to elect a majority of the members of a legislative council; and by forming a general assembly, rather more than one half of whose members were to be delegated by the spokesmen of the villages. Sir A. Lyall claims that 'no material alteration has been made in these institutions during the twenty years that have passed since they were founded by Lord Dufferin in 1883'; and, in a certain sense, Sir A. Lyall is right. In theory the institutions which Lord Dufferin founded still exist. Egypt is still provided with a legislative council, which does not legislate, and with a general assembly that does not assemble. As Lord Cromer writes, with quiet sarcasm, in his latest report, 'Although the Legislative Council and Assembly have existed for some twenty years, suffi-

cient experience has not yet been gained of the working of these institutions to justify any confident forecast being made as to the services which in the future they may possibly render to Egypt. "The metamorphic spirit of the age," to use an expression employed by their distinguished author, operates slowly.'

In writing thus we have no desire to criticise harshly Lord Dufferin's famous report; on the contrary, it is clear that he understood the situation much better than his employers at home. While they were announcing that 'British troops will be withdrawn from Egypt as promptly as may be permitted by a prudent examination of the country,' he had the prescience to foresee that they could not be withdrawn. It was

'absolutely necessary to prevent the fabric we have raised from tumbling to the ground the moment our sustaining hand is withdrawn. The administrative system must have time to consolidate, in order to resist the disintegrating influence from within and without, and to acquire the use and knowledge of its own capacities. Above all, the persons who have staked their future on its existence must have some guarantee that it will endure. . . . Unless they are convinced that we intend to shield and foster the system we have established, it will be vain to expect the timid politicians of the East to identify themselves with its existence.'

In these words, at any rate, Lord Dufferin showed that he grasped the main condition of the problem that he had been deputed to solve. Egypt, in 1883, had much more need of firm guidance than of a legislative council or a general assembly; and it is to Lord Cromer's administrative capacity, and not to Lord Dufferin's elaborate report, that she owes her regeneration.

We need not loiter over the months during which, after his return from Egypt, Lord Dufferin continued to occupy the British embassy at Constantinople. In our judgment there is something inexpressibly painful in the position of a distinguished diplomatist sincerely anxious to promote the welfare of the populations of the Turkish Empire, but thwarted at every turn by the indifference or opposition of his brother ambassadors, and the cunning and procrastinating tendencies of Turkish statecraft. In August 1884, a little more than two years

after his arrival at Constantinople, he was happily summoned home to discharge more important duties. Lord Ripon was laying down the Indian Viceroyalty; and Lord Dufferin was chosen to succeed Lord Ripon.

Sir Alfred Lyall, with the natural predilections of a distinguished Indian official, says that, 'for an Englishman, the grand climacteric of honour and power is attained when he enters upon the Governor-generalship of India, and has been passed from the hour when he resigns it.' This is perhaps excessive, but we readily admit that there is no other position under the British Crown, outside the limits of the United Kingdom itself, so worthy of the ambition of a great Englishman. Lord Dufferin, years before, had undoubtedly aspired to this great office. But Lord Northbrook had been preferred to him in 1872, and he had been sent to win distinction elsewhere. In 1884, when he was finally chosen to preside over the destinies of our great eastern Empire, he had attained an age when most men think it wiser to retire from the heat of an Indian climate; he had completed his fifty-eighth year; and, during the preceding twelve years, he had been continuously occupied with labour in Canada, St Petersburg, Constantinople, and Egypt, which would have strained the strength of many a younger man.

Lord Dufferin, however, on his arrival at Calcutta, showed no symptom either of the fatigue which results from work, or of the lassitude which attends age. He threw himself into the multifarious duties of a Governor-general; and his singular capacity for assimilating and explaining the views of other men, who had thoroughly mastered the subjects on which they were called on to advise, enabled him to make his mark on Indian legislation. He showed, moreover, the same desire which he had displayed ten years before in Canada, to make himself personally acquainted with every part of the country; and he not only visited Madras and Bombay, but he travelled from the farthest west to the farthest east of the Indian Empire. In this article, however, we have no space to consider the domestic matters which engrossed Lord Dufferin's attention. We must confine ourselves to those questions of foreign policy which thrust themselves to the front immediately after his arrival in India.

The foreign policy of the Indian Empire is necessarily

affected by the attitude of the Foreign Office at home to other Powers; and in 1884 the relations of this country with other European nations were not too friendly. The proceedings at the Congress of Berlin had naturally irritated Russia; the occupation of Egypt was equally distasteful to France; and Russia on the north-west and France on the north-east were near neighbours of our Indian Empire.

Disputes with Russia in Europe had always created anxieties on our Indian frontier. Distrust of Russia in the thirties had led to the first Afghan war; the Crimean war had been largely responsible for the Persian war of 1856-7; and the Russo-Turkish war of 1877 had been followed by a renewed occupation of Afghanistan, by the dethronement of Shere Ali, and the installation of Abdurrahman at Cabul. But these events had not allayed the prevailing uneasiness. The constant advance of Russia towards Afghanistan, and the occupation of Merv, had created the anxiety which the Duke of Argyll had called 'Mervousness'; and Lord Dufferin's immediate predecessor, Lord Ripon, had formally assured the Amir that the British Government, 'admitting no right of interference by foreign powers in his country, undertook to aid him in repelling unprovoked aggression, provided that he followed our advice in regard to external relations.' Wisely or unwisely, therefore, we had undertaken to defend the vague and ill-defined frontier of a kingdom hundreds of miles from our own territory. There seemed every prospect that we might be called upon to redeem the pledge which we had thus given; for exactly the same influences which had carried our own army to the Himalayas were stimulating the advance of Russia to the south; and at last, in March 1885—a few months after Lord Dufferin's arrival in India—Russian troops occupied Panjdeh, a fertile valley within the Afghan frontier, and created by so doing the crisis which Lord Ripon had undertaken to meet in arms.

It fortunately happened that, at the moment when news of this occupation reached India, the Amir himself, in response to Lord Dufferin's invitation, was the Viceroy's guest at Rawal Pindi. Lord Dufferin soon found that, while British statesmen and the British people were disposed to regard the occupation of Panjdeh as an affront which

might require to be avenged by war, Abdurrahman looked upon it 'as one of those not intolerable irregularities which occasionally happen on a rough unsettled frontier, and which are not supposed to have any necessary connexion with formal hostilities.' Lord Dufferin also ascertained that, in the Amir's opinion, a new advance of a British force into Afghanistan, for the purpose of defending the Amir against the Russians, was a much greater calamity than the loss of a few square miles of disputed territory. The Amir, in fact, was determined that Afghanistan should not be made the battlefield of other nations. His refusal of military assistance 'came as an unexpected relief from the liabilities arising out of the territorial guarantee.' It paved the way for an understanding with Russia; and, through the efforts of the British Foreign Office and the energy of Colonel (now Sir West) Ridgeway, both at St Petersburg and on the Afghan frontier, the boundary of Russia and Afghanistan was successfully delimited, and one effectual step was taken to secure the peace of the world.

The preservation of peace, however, on this occasion was due neither to Lord Ripon, who had guaranteed the safety of the Indian frontier, nor to Lord Dufferin, who might have found it necessary to redeem Lord Ripon's pledge, but to Abdurrahman's sensible conclusion that the loss of Panjdeh was preferable to a British army in Afghanistan. But, because we ascribe the preservation of peace to the Amir, we must not be supposed to underrate the merit of Lord Dufferin's conduct. A less ready man might have failed to divine the Amir's views; a less sagacious man might have failed to take advantage of them. Lord Dufferin had hardly paved the way for a settlement on the north-west before new difficulties arose on the north-east of India. Between the possessions which the French had acquired in Tonquin and our Indian Empire lay the still independent portions of Siam and the remnant of the Burmese Empire known as Upper Burma. The relations between Burma and India had never been friendly; and in 1879 it was thought advisable to withdraw the British Resident from Mandalay, the capital of the kingdom. In 1885, when Lord Dufferin was preparing to meet the Amir,

a report was passed up to headquarters from British Burma that King Theebaw had executed a treaty with the French

Government, under which special consular and commercial privileges were accorded to France. The news came at an awkward moment, for England and Russia were just then on the verge of a serious dispute over the Afghan boundary, and it raised a question of extreme gravity.'

In fact, so long as war with Russia was possible, common prudence suggested a policy of abstention in Burma. But the arrangement with the Amir, which removed the danger of war in the north-west, left Lord Dufferin free to deal with the new difficulty on the north-eastern frontier of India.

The troubles which had thus successively arisen in Afghanistan and Burma were fundamentally similar, although the circumstances were very different. Sir Alfred Lyall tells us—and Sir Alfred has probably studied more closely than any other Englishman the policy of buffer-states—

'Just as a fortress or a line of entrenchments requires an open space around or in front of it, so it is manifestly advantageous for the security of a kingdom to be surrounded by a ring of territories with which powerful neighbours must not meddle. . . . The kingdom of Burma, which marched with Lower Bengal on its eastern frontier, had always been reckoned as part of the glacis that encircles our Indian lines of defence.'

Nothing can be clearer than this statement. Yet, as we shall show almost immediately, Sir Alfred Lyall himself throws, in another passage, some doubt upon it. Lord Dufferin, at any rate, seems from the first to have had no faith in the buffer policy.

'If' (he wrote) 'the French proceedings should eventuate in any serious attempt to forestall us in Upper Burma, I should not hesitate to annex the country; and, as at present advised, I think that this mode of procedure would be preferable to setting up a doubtful prince.'

He wrote still more strongly in the following October.

'As to the relative advantages of placing a protected prince upon the throne, or of annexation pure and simple, I have no hesitation in saying that the latter is the better course. It is quite enough to be worried by a buffer policy on the West without reduplicating it on the East. Moreover, elasticity and a certain power of intermediate resistance are the essen-

tial qualities which constitute a "buffer," and to a certain though limited extent they may be said to exist in Afghanistan; but Burma is so soft and pulpy a substance that she could never be put to such a use.'

On the refusal, therefore, of the Burmese Government to receive a British mission, General Prendergast was ordered to march on Mandalay; and the conquest of Upper Burma was accomplished with as much ease as the conquest of Scindh had been effected, with even less justification, nearly fifty years before.

The annexation of Upper Burma added to the British Empire an area larger than that of France, and a population roughly computed at 4,000,000. But, far from removing the real cause which had led to it, our boundary was carried nearer to the French possessions. Some years afterwards, when Lord Dufferin was himself ambassador at Paris, the French advance in Siam led to a renewal of the old trouble. The British Government desired to neutralise, as a buffer-state or intermediate zone between Burma and French Tonquin, a small outlying tract lying on both sides of the Mekong river. Under Lord Dufferin's guidance at Paris the policy of the buffer was abandoned; and the Mekong became the frontier of France and England. Sir Alfred Lyall adds the commentary:—

'The project of maintaining an independent tract on the Upper Mekong eventually proved not worth the trouble that had been expended over it. Both parties had at first agreed to it; yet neither appears clearly to have understood that the system of neutralising petty independent states lying between powerful rivals, jealous of each other's ascendancy ... is not applicable to Asia.'

A conclusion which we believe to be sound, but a conclusion which we fail to reconcile with Sir Alfred's apology for the buffer system, with which he introduces his Burmese chapter.

We must pass over the other and minor questions with which Lord Dufferin was concerned in India. We cannot even dwell on the projected mission to Lhasa, which he abandoned, and which Lord Curzon has carried out. Lord Dufferin's services in India gained him a marquise:

he had been raised to an earldom in 1872. His own advancing years, and his natural desire to promote the interests of his children, induced him to seek employment nearer home before his full period of service was over; and, at the end of 1888, he returned to take up the embassy at Rome.

Lord Dufferin had still eight years of public work before him as ambassador at Rome and at Paris. At Rome he did good service in settling difficulties which had arisen between Italy and this country in north-east Africa. At Paris, where he was first received with suspicion and attacked with venom, he outlived his unpopularity and did something at a difficult time to soften the relations between the two great Powers of western Europe. At the end of 1896 he finally laid down the burden of office which he had borne so long. The few remaining years of life which were left to him were embittered by a catastrophe to which we need make no further reference. But, with this deplorable exception, he had passed a life which had been as happy and prosperous as it was useful and honourable.

It is not easy to sum up in a few sentences the merits of a statesman who filled so many offices, or the character of a man who showed such versatility, as Lord Dufferin. Greatly as he distinguished himself in many prominent positions, we are not, indeed, sure that he stands quite in the first place in any one of them. As a ruler of India, for example, he ranks below Lord Dalhousie; as a diplomatist he ranks below Lord Ampthill. But Lord Dalhousie could not have made the Canadian speeches; and Lord Ampthill could not have conquered or pacified Burma. It is not, however, the eminence which he attained in any one position, but the versatility which enabled him to do so many things well that impresses the imagination. And this amazing versatility was evident in small things as well as in great. For the man who pacified the Lebanon, who won the loyalty of the Canadians, who taught his own fellow-countrymen the value of Canada, who laid down the principles on which the government of Egypt should be based, who saved us from war with Russia in Afghanistan, and who gave us Upper Burma, was the same man, who could make a fluent speech in dog-Latin in Iceland, who

could reply to a Greek address in Greek at McGill University, and who could hold half an hour's conversation with the Shah of Persia in Persian.

As an orator, Lord Dufferin stands on a pedestal by himself. Other men had more capacity in debate, and more skill in expounding a difficult subject; but none of his contemporaries excelled him in the qualities which—whether he wrote or spoke—enabled him to attract and command attention. Severe critics may indeed think that Lord Dufferin put too much colour into his speeches, too much metaphor into his despatches; but it may be replied that these very qualities ensured their being widely read at the time at which they were written or delivered. A more subdued tone might have seemed more suitable for an official document or an official utterance; but, if the Toronto speech had been couched in ordinary language, it would not have been read from one end of Canada to the other, or have been carried across the Atlantic and reproduced in this country.

The literary qualities which Lord Dufferin's speeches and writings display might have made him, in other circumstances, a distinguished man of letters. Pierre Loti himself, in his great novel, '*Pêcheur d'Islande*,' has no finer description of a storm in the northern sea than that which Sir Alfred quotes from the '*Letters from High Latitudes*.' But we are not sure that the readiness with which Lord Dufferin spoke and wrote did not occasionally induce him to speak when he had better have kept silence. Ambassadors, it is said, were once known as orators; but oratory is the last art which the modern diplomatist should cultivate. Lord Dufferin's annual speeches in the British Chamber of Commerce in Paris may have been useful, but they were—to use the word which he himself applied to the first of them—'risky.' Nothing but inconvenience would result if our ambassadors to the great countries of the Old and New Worlds were to think it within the lines of their duty to make public speeches in the capitals in which they reside either on their own position or on their country's policy.

Lord Dufferin's public utterances were, no doubt, partly inspired by the knowledge that, in the capacity for public speaking, he had few superiors. Most men take a natural pleasure in doing those things which they

know they do exceptionally well. The love of displaying his own personality—which, in an inferior man, we might be tempted to call by the harsh term 'self-advertisement'—probably also accounted for the magnificence with which Lord Dufferin liked to surround himself. His expenditure, both in Canada and St Petersburg, must have seriously crippled an estate whose value had already been diminished by the cost of unremunerative improvements and the effects of the Irish land laws. It seems ungenerous to condemn an expenditure undertaken in the public service for public objects. But it is undesirable that our diplomatists and our colonial governors should largely outspend the incomes attached to the posts which they fill, for, by doing so, they make it difficult for the Ministry of the day to select the best possible men for these posts; they restrict the choice, not to the best men, but to the best men of ample wealth.

When all this has been said, however, Lord Dufferin will be recollected as a statesman who filled many high positions and who discharged their duties with credit to himself and advantage to his country. In private life he will be remembered as the best of friends and the most agreeable of companions. We wish that Sir Alfred Lyall could have told us a little more of the social qualities of a man whom he knew so well, and who endeared himself to so large a circle of his contemporaries. We derive some idea of what Lord Dufferin was in his youth from his mother's admirable letters to him; but we get no adequate account from Sir Alfred Lyall of the qualities which made him, to the very end of his life, the most agreeable of companions and the most sympathetic of friends.

With this one exception, we have nothing but praise for Sir Alfred Lyall. He has given us an excellent life of one of the most distinguished men of his time. He has succeeded in reducing his narrative to dimensions which we cordially recommend as an example to inferior and more diffuse biographers, and he has given us a book which the ordinary reader will read with pleasure and the historian will consult with profit.

Art. II.—THE WANDERINGS OF ODYSSEUS.

Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée. Par Victor Bérard. Two vols. Paris: Armand Colin, 1902-3.

THE highest qualifications which a commentator can hope to possess are perhaps two. First, he should have read his author with close and vivid understanding, so that each word and each sentence mean more to him than to the ordinary reader. Here he is simply serving his author. Secondly, he should have a wide knowledge of the outside subjects which have in various ways influenced his author's mind or expression or personal history. In this he is not exactly serving, he is rather standing outside and, in a way, above his author; and the work he produces has a substantive value apart from mere commentary. M. Victor Bérard's great book on Homer, with its rather misleading title, '*Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée*,' possesses both these qualities to a remarkable degree. He is a most acute reader of Homer's text; and he knows certain subjects of vital importance to Homeric study with a clearness and, so far as one can judge, a profundity which have perhaps never been equalled in the history of scholarship. Above all, M. Bérard knows the Mediterranean. He knows it as a scientific geographer; he knows it as a sailor and explorer; he knows the reefs, the winds, the islands, the deep bays and the shallow bays, the sailing-boats and the rowing-boats, the discomforts and the dangers; and he knows the history, the true sailor's history, of this oldest of seas. From Hanno, Scylax, and Avienus, down to the medieval travellers and the seventeenth century corsairs, he has mastered the literature of the Mediterranean and brought to it a keenness of interest and imagination which is rare among learned men. It is this quality which constitutes, in our judgment, the extraordinary value of his work, and makes it, in spite of obvious weaknesses and grave errors of method, not only a delightful book for any cultured reader, but also an almost indispensable one for a specialist.

M. Bérard, like most scholars, regards the '*Odyssey*,' or at least those parts of it which comprise the adventures of Telemachus and the return of Odysseus to

Ithaca, as one of the 'Nostoi,' or 'home-comings of heroes,' which formed a recognised subject of epic legend. The theory which he is concerned to prove in these two large volumes is that this part of the 'Odyssey' is formed by 'the integration in a Greek "Nostos" of a "Periplus" or Pilot's Guide to the Mediterranean, written in a Semitic language, and in use upon Phœnician ships (ii, 577). These 'Periploi,' or guides, form a branch of literature not very familiar to most readers. The guide that M. Bérard himself constantly quotes is the French official publication, 'Instructions Nautiques.' The editors of this work say:—

We have used the "Mediterranean Pilot" of the English Admiralty, the work in use on board the Italian fleet. For the isles of Malta and Gozo we have translated verbally the instructions of the "Mediterranean Pilot" (vol. i, 1885), completing them with the aid of information since published by the Hydrographic Office in London.'

At present, therefore, the English 'Pilot' sets the standard. But from 1702 to 1830 all nations followed or copied the 'Portulan' of Henry Michelot, the French chief pilot. Before Michelot, the French copied the Dutch 'Mirrors of the Sea'; the 'Mirrors,' in their turn, were copied from Spanish and Italian 'Portulans,' which were descended from the ancient 'Periploi' of Rome and Greece. The Greeks and Romans, as we know from the 'Periploi' of Hanno and of Himilco, translated the guides of the Carthaginians. We cannot trace the whole series; but we are told in the Greek version of Hanno that his 'Periplus' was inscribed in public in the temple of Kronos at Carthage; and we actually find inscribed on the walls of Dair-el-Bahari a contemporary account of a voyage down the Red Sea long before the date of the 'Odyssey.'

The present writer believes that on this main thesis M. Bérard has almost proved his point, and that a 'Mediterranean Pilot' of Phœnician origin will probably find a place in any future enquiry into the sources of the Homeric poems. But it should be stated clearly that the value of the whole book does not depend very greatly on the rightness or wrongness of the final results obtained. There are a thousand results by the way that are in any

case true and illuminating; and no one can read the book without having his eyes opened to many things in Homer which he has missed before.

It will be convenient, for purposes of criticism, to divide the book into three main heads—(1) contributions to the geography and history of the ancient Mediterranean; (2) theories about the Phœnicians; (3) identifications of Homeric sites. We will take instances to illustrate M. Bérard's method in each case; but it must be confessed that illustrations will not do justice to the book. A great part of its charm and power depends on the richness and dexterity with which the author piles one upon another his acute observations, suggestions, and surprises, and on the accumulative force of similarities and coincidences which might in small numbers seem accidental.

M. Bérard starts by laying great stress on the comparatively new study of topology, the science by which, from the consideration of geographical facts about a locality, one can draw deductions as to its history. (He is influenced here by G. Hirschfeld's '*Zur Typologie Griechischer Ansiedelungen*,' published in 1884.) We find the older maritime towns of Brittany, for instance, all built on rivers, and rather far up, above the last bridge; the new towns, which have outstripped them, are on the sea. We conclude that, when Nantes was built, the sea was dangerous; when Saint-Malo was built, it was safe. There was no longer a perpetual fear of the raids of the English. It is much the same with the old towns in Greece, which, as Thucydides tells us, were built, not on the shore, but on hills some way off, for fear of pirates. If, therefore, we find, as we do, that several places bearing the name of '*Astypalaia*,' or '*old town*,' are built, not in this way, but close down to the sea on low, long promontories and places shut off from the mainland, we conclude that these were not indigenous Greek '*old towns*,' but were built by people to whom the sea was safe and the land dangerous—those whom M. Bérard calls '*thalassocrats*.' To take a different case: the position of Mycenæ has always been something of a puzzle. At the entry of a defile, a day's march from the coast, provided with good water, but with no rich territory or visible re-

sources, protected by rocks and ravines, crouching behind enormous fortifications, stands Mycenæ, 'rich in gold.'

'On se demande' (say Perrot and Chipiez) 'à quoi a pu servir sur ce faite tout cet appareil de murs et de portes. . . . Il semble que les Mycéniens, accoutumés à entasser les quartiers de rocs, aient bâti ce fort pour le plaisir de bâtir et qu'ils aient pris une peine vraiment inutile. En revanche c'était la un site merveilleusement choisi pour une tour de guet.'

In reality Mycenæ was a *dervendji*, a fort, such as the caravans of the eighteenth century met at every *dervend* or pass of the Balkans, of Pindus, Taurus, and Lebanon. Mycenæ commands the great pass between the two gulfs of Argolis and of Corinth. It lived on the tolls it drew. In the *dervends* of modern Turkey the tolls are levied mostly by ill-clad mercenaries in the employ of some pasha. But there have been, even in recent times, independent holders of forts, like the great Ali Pacha, 'the bey of beys,' corresponding, not so very remotely, with Agamemnon, the king of kings. Ali Pacha flourished when the insecurity of the seas compelled merchandise between Central Europe and the East to follow the mountain passes. But later in the nineteenth century the seas became safe. Steamers began to go round the peninsula, and the forts and fortunes of the Albanian beys crumbled away like the ramparts of Mycenæ.

The mention of these passes leads us to an important principle in ancient seafaring which M. Bérard calls 'la loi des Isthmes.' The primitive merchant in his small, light, and generally uncovered boat, with no cabin accommodation, made his long journeys with a maximum of land travel and a minimum of sea. Instead of sailing round a point he preferred to disembark and cross an isthmus. Consider the occupation of Deceleia by the Spartans in the Peloponnesian war. Deceleia is an inland fortress, equally distant from all the Athenian coasts. What effect can its occupation have had upon the food supply of a power which still held the seas? Thucydides tells us. Corn used to come from Eubœa across the strait and then by land across Attica, passing through Deceleia. To us, looking at the map, it seems almost incredible. But the fact remains that, to the ancients, it was convenient to pack the corn in boats, take it across

the strait from Chalkis to Oropus, unpack it, repack it on mules and donkeys, and then march it across the mountain passes to Athens, rather than carry it in the same boat round the peninsula to Piræus. Thucydides says so explicitly. And Dicæarchus in the third century B.C., and Paul Lucas early in the eighteenth century A.D., mention, as a matter of course, that in coming from Egripo (Chalkis) to Athens they first crossed the strait and then travelled on horseback.

Again, how do we explain the wealth and power of Troy—a town on a hill, surrounded by poor country, mostly marsh. Where did it find its riches? Why, among other things, is it built so far from the sea, much farther than was necessary for safety? A detailed map and the 'law of the isthmuses' will explain all. The plain of the Scamander is in reality an isthmus, reaching from Besika Bay in the archipelago to Koum-Kaleh in the Dardanelles. It is a broad, squat, and flat isthmus, between two stretches of hill, the chain of Mount Sigeum on the sea side and the high ground of Ilion on the other. The river almost stagnates; and branches of it flow south as well as north. In Homeric times the ground must have been less silted up, and the isthmus consequently less broad—ten kilometres at most. Just above this isthmus, equidistant from the two seas, Ilion fixed its acropolis. It was not a great distance—it was almost no distance—for ships to go round Cape Sigeum, yet, as a matter of history, merchandise must have followed the land route. The 'Instructions Nautiques' will explain why. The wind and the current are both unfavourable to northward-bound vessels. The Etesian winds are predominant for nine months of the year.

'In winter . . . navigation is impossible for sailing-ships. . . . In summer, the N.E. winds are constant. They generally rise in the morning and fall at night. It is not rare to see in the channel of Tenedos and other harbours two or three hundred ships waiting a favourable wind. With every puff from the south they put up sail, but only to go from one anchorage to the next. And they only reach the sea of Marmora after traversing in little stages all the distance between.'

Once in the Dardanelles things are much easier, especially if you hug the Asiatic coast.

In Priam's days nearly the whole of the trade bound northwards for the Dardanelles, the Propontis, and the Euxine, was unshipped under his gates and carried across his isthmus by his porters and carriers, after paying the tolls that he considered due to his dignity. (The southward traffic very possibly preferred to go round Cape Sigeum.) This throws light, not only on the wealth and importance of Troy, but also on its extreme unpopularity, on the two expeditions of united Greeks to destroy such an oppressive *douane*, and on the various thefts of Laomedon—the dog, the horses, and the golden candlestick. It was perilously easy for the Lord of Troy to detain any merchandise that specially attracted his fancy.

A curious point, for instance, emerges about the habit followed by Homeric ships of starting in the night. When Telemachus, at the end of the second book, is setting out in search of tidings of his father, the proceedings are described as follows. Athena went through the city and told the crew to be ready at the ship 'in the evening.' Then she got the ship from Noëmon. Then 'the sun set and all the ways were darkened.' The men dragged the ship to the sea and put the tackle in, but not the provisions or cargo. Then they 'set' her—towed or rowed her—to the extremity of the harbour. Then Athena returned to the palace, where the suitors had already gone, under divine influence, to sleep, and called out Telemachus. Telemachus and Athena went down to the ship and brought the crew up to the palace to collect the provisions which were there prepared in secret. They carried these on board and loosed the cables; a good north-west wind, 'Zephyros,' filled the sail and drove them on all the night. The men lay about in the ship and drank wine and poured libations.

It is at the same time, the dark of night, that Odysseus leaves the isle of the Phæacians; at the same time that the Phœnician corsair leaves the isle of Syria. The 'Mediterranean Pilot' gives us the reason (iv, 470; cf. iv, 7). 'During the summer, and also in fine weather in winter, regular land and sea breezes prevail in the various gulfs and deep bays . . . the sea-breeze usually commencing about 10 A.M. and lasting until sunset, the land-breeze beginning about 11 P.M.' (This passage refers to the mainland; but the same is said at greater length

about the islands.) The hostile sea-breeze was blowing throughout the day; at sunset it fell, and the men drew their ship out to the end of the harbour. Three or four hours of calm; and then, about 11 P.M., the land-breeze rose, and they sailed out to sea. Once out at sea, they fell in with the prevailing wind of the summer season, which is, according to the same 'Pilot,' the north-west, exactly the 'ἀκραῖς Ζέφυρος' which they needed to take them to Elis. All that remained was to touch land soon after sunrise. This is surely convincing. There is almost no thesis to maintain or deny. M. Bérard has merely made us understand the exactness and reasonableness of details which seemed meaningless before.

One of the most striking chapters in the book is that entitled 'La Course,' that innocent-seeming word denoting in reality the profession of a corsair. The memoirs of three 'Frankish' writers of the seventeenth century in especial are used for comparison with the narrative of Odysseus. Thévenot and Robert, the latter an Englishman, were both of them corsairs against their will, while Paul Lucas adopted the profession from taste. These Franks, though with a lower standard of morality, managed their raids just as Odysseus did. They carried on all business by means of solemn oaths, which they observed fairly well. They generally obtained, by fraud or force, accomplices among the people they were attacking. They were often starved and pestilence-ridden at sea. They gorged themselves on 'wine and flesh unspeakable' when they got the chance, a certain de Saumery remarking, after one such occasion, 'I could scarcely breathe for twenty-four hours.' They chose the same localities for raiding, affecting particularly the land of the Cicones and the Egyptian delta. Occasionally, from carelessness or over-eating, they stayed too long on shore; and then the people from farther inland surprised them, as the Cicones surprised Odysseus. We hear incidentally why the inland Cicones were ἄμα πλέονες καὶ ἀρείους. It was because the coasts were almost depopulated by these corsairs. The well-to-do people lived in walled towns away from the sea; only the poorest folk stayed to be murdered.

To take one point more in detail: what a clear light does the following account of Lampeduza throw upon the problem of the rise of Delos—a barren rock, inhabited by

quails, with nothing to recommend it except a harbour, a good spring of water, and a shrine.

'Lampeduza is a little island or rock . . . deserted, but full of rabbits . . . about 100 miles from Malta. As there is good water, ships go there frequently. The harbour is very good. There is in this island a little chapel with an image of the Virgin, greatly respected by both Christians and infidels. Every vessel leaves there some gift or other of money, biscuit, wine, oil, gunpowder, bullet, sword or musket. When a sailor wants any of these articles he takes it and leaves money or something else in its place. The Turks observe the rule as well as the Christians. As to the money, no one touches it; and the galleys from Malta pass by every year, take the money on the altar and carry it to Notre Dame de Trapano in Sicily.' (Thévenot, ii, 88.)

Delos was almost exactly the same, except that it had quails instead of rabbits. The vital difference was that the gifts on the altar of Delos were not taken away each year, but allowed to remain under the care of priests, and grow into a rich temple-foundation.

So far we have nothing but praise for M. Bérard's work. Now we proceed to more ambiguous ground. He has entitled the whole, 'Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée'; and his Phœnician theories are evidently precious to him. His book, like his previous study of 'Les Cultes Arcadiens,' represents a reaction against the undue neglect of Semitic influences which has been usual in Greek historians and archaeologists during the last twenty years. Much of his work will, we believe, prove on examination to be valuable and even true; but there can be little doubt that, as a whole, it is open to two adverse criticisms. The theory of Phœnician influence is stated in so exaggerated a form that it cannot be reconciled with known archaeological facts; and the methods followed are often arbitrary and unscientific.

One cause of misunderstanding lies, we think, in M. Bérard's fondness for the convenient but bérard dangerous term 'thalassocratie.'

'Throughout all recorded history the Mediterranean has been, as it were, an empire in which there reigns one sea-power (*marine*) as almost absolute mistress. This dominant power

maintains law and order, levies tributes or benevolences, imposes its habits and its language, and produces the result that the sea is, turn by turn, an English, French, Italian, Arab, or Greek lake. . . . At all periods the various sea-peoples go humbly to school, under the rod and subject to the exploitation of the thalassocrats, navigate like them, count and pay like them, dress like them, and often speak like them' (i, 15).

This in itself is surely a considerable exaggeration. The Mediterranean has never, except for a period under the Roman Empire, actually been a 'lake' in the possession of any one power. It has only once or twice been in danger of becoming so. At present England is the thalassocrat. Yet in *Ægean* waters French money predominates over ours. Italian influence, in matters of seamanship and habits of life, is fully as strong as ours. England is very far from the position of an 'absolute mistress,' and it may be doubted whether any of the other thalassocrats have ever been much nearer. But this exaggeration is not the only one. Having shown—as we think he succeeds in showing—that Phœnician influence was great in marine matters, M. Bérard sometimes speaks as if this proved the existence of a Phœnician empire, and even implies that this empire was like a civilised power among barbarians.

'Les Phéniciens arrivaient avec des vaisseaux pleins de camelote, c'est à dire de marchandises pour Barbares, de verroterie pour nègres. . . . Il est inutile d'insister sur le vin et les autres boissons fermentées. Les Phéniciens "intoxiquaient" alors les sauvages de la mer Intérieure comme nous intoxiquons aujourd'hui les sauvages des mers africaines ou malaises.'

Now this, one may fairly say, is demonstrably a false conception. Twenty years ago such a view might have been possible. But of late years a long series of excavations in various sites, now culminating in Crete, have shown the existence of a high civilisation in the islands and western shores of the *Ægean*—a civilisation which can be traced, stage by stage, sometimes city by city, from the very beginnings of the bronze age; which was not imposed by one ruling power, but seems to have grown up contemporaneously in some dozen different centres; which, by whatever name we call it—Mycenæan,

Pelasgian, Ægean, or Minoan—seems, by its race-characteristics, to be Aryan, not Semitic; and which certainly cannot be the work of alien thalassocrats.

Mr. A. J. Evans has shown that certain stages, and those by no means early ones, of Cretan civilisation are contemporary with the twelfth dynasty in Egypt. This in itself takes us, so far as the known data go, considerably earlier than the beginnings of any sea-borne influence from Sidon. Mycenæan pottery, again, cannot be in origin Phœnician, because it is made of local clay in the various centres. The celebrated 'island stones' of steatite, with their characteristic ornament of the *ἄγριμι* or wild goat, cannot have been made in Phœnicia. Phœnicia possessed no steatite and no wild goats. The goat in question is peculiar to Crete and Melos; the steatite is specially abundant in Crete. Nor are Phœnicians likely to have made the glass objects found at Mycenæ. The glass-worker's moulds have been found, and are made of Ægean steatite. The glass itself has all the marks of being home-made, being uniform in fabric, and totally distinct from any glass found in Egypt or elsewhere. Even the history of the alphabet tells against any theory of a preponderant influence of Phœnicia in very early times. The absence of Phœnician inscriptions earlier than 1000 B.C. seems to show that, during the period of the eighteenth dynasty at any rate, the peoples of the Syrian coast still wrote in cuneiform. Mr Evans has found in Crete a script which has all the appearance of being the prototype of the Phœnician letters, and quotes Diodorus to the effect that, according to local Cretan tradition, the Phœnicians did not invent their letters, but adapted symbols already existing to the uses of an alphabet. The whole of this evidence, which might be largely increased, seems to point in the same direction, viz. that Phœnicia before 1000 B.C. was not the originator nor the centre, but a recipient and a point upon the fringe, of Ægean civilisation.

The evidence from Cyprus, as Mr J. L. Myres has shown, is of crucial significance here. That island stands so close to the Syrian coast, and eventually fell so completely under Phœnician power, that, if Phœnicia were the mother-land of Ægean civilisation, or even if there had been in early Mycenæan times a strong Phœnician

thalassocracy, Cyprus could not have escaped its influence. It would have been more full of Mycenæan-Phœnician remains than any of the islands. As a matter of fact, it is just the reverse.*

Again, the course of discovery in Palestine and Egypt gives us some clear glimpses of the course of events on the Syrian coast during the years 2000-664 B.C. Egypt supplies contemporary accounts of the coast towns during the eighteenth dynasty protectorate and the anarchy which followed, showing persistent aggressions of the western, non-Semitic 'peoples of the sea.' Palestine, like Cyprus, gives us a picture of the permeation of the Levant by Ægean culture and colonisation.

These considerations must modify fundamentally our conception of the Phœnician sea-power. M. Bérard's language on the subject is at times studiously correct; but at other times most readers will feel that he has given the rein to fantasy, and admitted something mythical and almost miraculous into his conception of the wealth, wisdom, daring, and omnipresence of these primeval thalassocrats. There was at no time a Phœnician sea-empire over the Mediterranean. What there was at a certain date in the sixth century we can see from the great passages in the Hebrew prophets, from Isaiah xxiii and Ezekiel xxvi, xxvii, xxviii.† The whole of the greatness of Tyre is set forth in Ezekiel xxvii; but it is the greatness of 'the merchant city.' Commerce with the east and west, from Tarshish to Asshur, is there mentioned; ships, merchandise, and private riches, cloths and fine linen, spices and precious stones and gold, wisdom and high walls and 'perfect beauty'; but never a word of empire, present nor past. It is not as to a fallen queen, nor a strong tyrant at last overthrown, that Isaiah speaks his great words: 'Take an harp, go about the city, thou harlot that hast been forgotten; make sweet melody, sing many songs, that thou mayest be remembered.'

This was, of course, many centuries later than the Mycenæan period contemplated by M. Bérard. We shall

* Cf. J. L. Myres in *Classical Review*, x, 350 ff.; Ridgeway, *Early Age of Greece*, I, 270 ff.

† Cf. Isaiah ii, 16; probably eighth century.

consider the question of dates later. Our present point is that Phœnician influence in Greece, whenever we find it, is always the permeating influence of petty trade, not the ruling and guiding influence of a great civilising power. If we take, and take in a liberal and unsceptical spirit, the words in Greek that are sometimes alleged to be drawn from Phœnician sources, they point to the same conclusion. The first that occur are the names of spices and unguents—*κιννάμωμον*, *κασία*, *μύρρα*, *νάρδος*, etc.; of cloths and fine linen—*κιθών*, *ὀθόνη*, *φᾶρος*, *λίτα*; of gold, *χρυσός*, and perhaps *φᾶσις*, and terms connected with the purple fishery. There are some, it is true, recently put forward by Assmann in 'Das Floss der Odyssee,' which go deeper into common life. These are—*ἀγαπάω* (*agab*, love), *γάμος* (*gam*, together), *μαζός* (*matzah*, suck), *πάλλαξ* (*pillegesh*, concubine), possibly *εὐνή*; *μάχομαι* (*machah* and *machats*, both early words); the stem *λαθ-* (*lât*, secrecy); *βωμός* (*bâmah*, altar), and possibly *θάλαμος* and *θησαυρός*.

Now these words are words of common life. They seem at first sight to indicate a profound permeation of language. Yet I venture to think that most travellers who have noticed what sort of words, English and French, are first picked up by the natives in eastern ports, will draw a much slighter conclusion. The first five in the above list refer to relations between the sexes. (The word *γάμος*, it should be remarked, in answer to Max Schmidt's recent criticism of Assmann, does not exactly mean *Ehe* in Greek, but merely *zusammensein*.) The next two ('fight' or 'thrash,' and 'secrecy' or 'on the sly') are only too often their concomitants. There remains *βωμός*, altar, which affords no difficulty, since the Phœnicians were in the habit of building a 'bâmah' at each of their stations.* These words then, even if the suggested derivation is in each case right, show, not a profound Semitic influence in the heart of Greek life, but only a certain amount of borrowing of the terms used by sailors on shore in foreign ports. The sailors in question need not belong to superior races; the same kind of interchange is said to take place

* Since the above was written, Miss J. E. Harrison has shown from the evidence of monuments that the *κηρυκεῖον*, or herald's staff, was probably Phœnician in origin. This is very important, but only points to the same conclusion as the word *βωμός*. The *κηρυκεῖον* was regularly carried by a boat in strange waters, as a sort of white flag or sign of peaceful intentions.

between Chinese and Malay, and between the divers languages of the South Sea islands. It is curious, certainly, that in Greek the foreign words were eventually adopted in preference to native words; but this may merely be due to the tendency, strong in all languages, to avoid the plain native word in all subjects where people are likely to feel shy.

But M. Bérard produces weightier evidence. He claims to have shown the existence in Greek lands of a whole network of routes, trading-stations, and factories, which, for geographical reasons, must have been formed by a foreign sea-power, and for linguistic reasons must be the work of Semites.

He relies greatly on an argument from what he calls 'systems of doublets.' All over the trade-routes of Homeric history, and especially among the islands of the Ægean, he finds that there exist places called by a Greek name and a non-Greek name at the same time; and that, further, the non-Greek name will, if treated as Semitic and referred to some known Semitic root, surprisingly often yield the same meaning as the Greek name. For instance the island Kasos is also called Achnê. Ἀχνη is Greek and means 'spray' or 'chaff'; 'Kasos' is not Greek, but the word *qas* in Hebrew means 'chaff blown before the wind.' And travellers have remarked on the great drift of spray that flies up from the S.E. shores of Kasos. Thasos, we are told by Pliny (iv, 12), was originally called Ἀερία, 'aerial.' 'Thasos' is meaningless in Greek, but the root *tôs* in Hebrew is applied to the swooping of a bird. Rheneia was also called Keladoussa; and the Hebrew substantive *rinnah* = κέλαδος, 'din.' Kythêra was also Scandeia, a Greek word meaning 'a kind of head-dress'; and *kether* is the Hebrew for 'bonnet.' (The reason of the name was a certain mitre-shaped rock at the entrance of the harbour.) Thouria was called Aipeia, 'high,' and *tur* = 'a high rock.' To take some slightly different cases: the various islands called Samos are all high, and Strabo tells us 'the ancients called heights Samoi.' The root *shâmah* means 'high,' commonly occurring only in the pl. *shâmaiim*, 'the heavens.' In the Homeric epithets of places and persons—who are often only places personified—M. Bérard finds similar doublets. Aiaie is Νῆσος Κίρκης, 'the isle of the she-hawk' and that would be the meaning of

ai-aiē (more correctly, *i-aiia*) in Hebrew. A famous rock is known as 'the Skulla,' or else as the abode of 'the Skulla,' because *s'qoulah* is, or at least by analogy is likely to have been, the Phœnician for 'stone' or 'stoning.' And since *s'qoulah* suggested the word σκύλαξ, 'dog', the 'Skulla of the rock' is made into a sort of dog-monster with the 'voice of a young whelp.' In the same way a certain heap of stones, used as a steering point on the Hellespont, which the Greeks called σῆμα, a 'mark,' and the Phœnicians *s'qoulah*, has become in the end a 'dog's mark' (*kynos-sema*); and, since legend says that Hecuba was buried there, the fancies of sailors add that Hecuba after death was changed into a dog.

This list is a mere selection from a very large collection of doublets which M. Bérard has got together. And it must be admitted that he has in every case shown geographical and historical reasons for the existence of a Phœnician name. The result is certainly most impressive at first sight, and remains so, we think, after certain necessary criticisms have been made and considered. Semitic philologists, as a rule, are somewhat scornful of these alleged doublets, on two grounds. First, they do not conform to known philological laws, such laws, for instance, as can be deduced from the equations of Tyros = Tsur, Sidon = Tsidon, Byblos = Gebâl, Karchêdon = Qartchadast, and others. But surely this is natural. The doublets often represent, not regular transcriptions, but rough shots. The sailors who find a strange name, to be mastered somehow, deal with it, as M. Bérard says, in one of three ways. They transcribe it unchanged, or as nearly unchanged as they can—as in such names as Syria, Egypt, Cyprus; or they translate it, like 'Apes' Hill' or 'Gulf of Lions'; or, having a difficulty in translation, and not being content with mere transcription, they in various ways knock the name about until it feels comfortable in their mouths; very often until 'ils arrivent, par quelque calembour, à faire sortir un sens apparent de ce vocable incompris.' This is the method by which the 'Bellérophon' became the 'Billy Ruffian,' by which Malœis (accus. Malœnta) became Beneventum (since Maleventum was an obviously undesirable name). It is in this way that the Greeks turned various Phœnician rocks (*solo*) into foundations of Solon, their capes (*rôes*)

into settlements of Rhodians. A curious instance is that of Mount Hymettos. The Italians turned it to *Il Matto*, 'the fool'; and the Turks and modern Greeks call it by translations of this name. The present writer was once directed by an English sailor in a Portuguese town to go down 'Rainy Street' and across 'Rolling Ocean Square.' The street was, of course, a street 'della Reina'; but 'Rolling Ocean Square' was a puzzle till one observed that the square in the right position had a pattern of coloured stones in its paving which rolled like great waves at sea. No philological rules would have helped one here; nor would they explain such a form as the Tongan word for dog, 'Kom-i-sa,' had not history, by a rare chance, preserved the memory of the first introducer of a dog into Tonga, and recorded his habit of addressing it with the words, 'Come here, sir!' In the same island anything bovine is known as a 'bull-a-ma-cow,' the reason being that those who introduced the animals spoke of importing 'a bull and a cow.' We may conclude from such instances—which are easily multiplied—that the transformations of foreign names are very tricky and uncertain things, and that much of M. Bérard's results may be mere guess-work; but we cannot reject them for their lack of adherence to philological rules.

The other objection is, we fear, well grounded, and we must state it roundly and boldly. It is that M. Bérard has the defects of his qualities; and the tricks which he plays with his innocent and fascinated reader are enough to make a sound scholar turn cold. If there is a word that will suit his purpose in any Semitic language, he takes it as Phœnician. If not, he invents, according to analogy, a hypothetical Phœnician form. For instance, in the midst of a brilliant argument about the names in the plain of the Alpheüs, he wishes to derive Phigalea from the Hebrew root which occurs in *piggul*, 'corruption.' He invents a word—*phigalea* (with *e* representing the Heb. *h*)—a form which neither exists nor, so far as one can see, is possible. We occasionally find references to 'the Semitic form' so-and-so, or so-and-so, the one being a known form, but not suitable to the author's purpose, the other a non-extant form which suits it exactly. The word *s'goulah* ('stone') is itself an instance.

Then his system of transliteration is, to say the

least, rather licentious. Lewy, the author of 'Semitische Fremdwörter,' complains that he represents Heb. *he* (= *h*) by the vowels *e* or *i*, or *ei* or *ai*—a very odd equation in any case, but made the more so by the consideration that the Hebrew feminine ending *-ah* stands for an old *-at*, which would be represented in Phœnician by either *-ât* or *-o*: He transliterates the letter 'ayin, generally represented by a rough breathing, in several ways: by a smooth breathing, by a rough breathing, by nothing, by *g*, and by the vowel *o*. For instance, the island 'Ωλίανος was also named 'Τλήσσα; he therefore derives it from the Hebrew for 'mountain of the forest,' *ôl-jar*. This may well be right; but the form would really be 'âl-jâ'ar. Similarly, he speaks of Hebrew *Solo* or *Salo* as the origin of Σόλοι; but the Hebrew word is *Sela'*. To explain Naxos he employs the Hebrew word for a signal, which he calls *nax*. It is actually *nês* (with a *samech*) for original *niss*. On many of these points, it should be said, he acts openly and on professed principles. For instance, he attaches great importance to the position of a letter in the alphabet, so that *he* = *e*, 'ayin = *o*, *samech* = *ξ*; but at times he yields to the temptation of silently representing a parallel or a derivation as rather neater and clearer than it is. (Cf. *Al-alî* above.)

However, when all deductions are made, the doublets present a remarkable chain of evidence, and we are disposed to admit in general terms the thesis which they are meant to prove—the co-existence of Greek and Semitic names at many points of the Ægean and on the trade-routes of the mainland. So the English have given names to many places on the Korean coast which have their Korean or Chinese equivalents; and, to come nearer home, there are Norse and Celtic doublets on the shores of Scotland. But we cannot infer more on behalf of the Phœnicians in the Mediterranean than we can for the Norsemen or the English in other localities, namely, that they were at one time the chief seafaring foreigners in those parts.

Yet the date at which these double names arose remains curiously obscure. M. Bérard pushes it far back. He supposes, if we understand him aright, that the routes and stations in Greece and Greek waters were established during the long Egyptian protectorate over Phœnicia,

about 1530-1400 B.C. Phœnicia represents the Egyptian empire on the seas. Crete and the island powers are vassals of Egypt; their civilisation is the work of Phœnician invaders. It is not clear what effect he attributes to the anarchy which followed the end of the eighteenth dynasty (B.C. 1400); but as to the second anarchy, after the thirty-first dynasty, about 1100 B.C., he follows Maspéro. The weakness of Egypt led to the first establishment of a Greek mercantile marine, imitated from and taught by the Phœnicians, which gradually, by the cheapness of the wares it carried, drove the Phœnicians out of their own waters. Hence came the daring expeditions of the Phœnicians towards the West, the founding of Gades in 1100 B.C., of Tarshish, and presumably of Carthage.

There are great difficulties in this conception. An early empire was not such a well-organised concern. Even Amenophis III, in the strongest period of his rule, and in the midst of the '*Paix Égyptienne*,' made a good many expeditions to keep order quite close to his borders in Asia, and was perpetually warring against his vassal Ethiopians. It seems much more likely that the good times for Tyre and Sidon were, generally, when the hand of Egypt was removed; and that we should look for the date of their great expansion in the two periods of Egyptian collapse, either after the eighteenth dynasty or after the thirty-first. Then the position assigned to Crete in this scheme is, as we have seen, scarcely a possible one. Again, Greek shipbuilding must have had a separate development of its own, and cannot have been learnt from the Phœnicians, because all the nautical terms in Greek are native words; none are Semitic. We may contrast the Latin terms, which are nearly all Greek, because the Romans learnt navigation from the Greeks. Again, the date 1100 B.C. assigned for the founding of Gades rests only on the authority of Pompeius Trogus, and is, on its merits, scarcely credible. The dates of all Phœnician colonies are very uncertain. Timæus, a good authority on most things, gives B.C. 814 as the foundation of Carthage; and it is surely most unlikely that Gades, any more than Utica, can have been earlier, not to say centuries earlier. As for Tarshish, the earliest mention of it seems to be in Isaiah, especially chap. xxiii, which

takes us to the eighth century, not the twelfth. And the Samians, it is worth remembering, found the market of Tarshish ἀκήρατον, 'virgin,' so late as about 630 B.C. (Herodot. iv, 152; cf. i, 163). Again, there are great difficulties in believing that any large Phœnician settlements in Sicily were earlier than the Greek. Factories or stations there probably were, since Thucydides says so; but they must have been weak and lacking in influence. The Greeks settled wherever they wished in Sicily, checked sometimes by natives, but never by Phœnicians, until the very end of their period of colonisation on the extreme west coast. It is also noteworthy that the Romans, Etruscans, and south Italians can scarcely have known the Phœnicians before the Greeks; on the contrary, they must have known them through the Greeks, for they call them by their Greek name, and, as remarked above, have borrowed Greek words, not Phœnician, for the nomenclature of their ships. Lastly, Professor Ettore Pais reports of the excavations in Sardinia, that no Phœnician remains in that island seem to be earlier than the sixth or at most the late seventh century.

In accord with this general result is the important fact that all mentions of the Phœnician or Sidonian merchants in Homer come in the latest strata of the poems. In 'Iliad' vi, 290, it is Paris who goes to Sidon in his own ship; and the same holds for the passages in the 'Telemakheia' ('Odyssey' iv; cf. xv, 118). The argument that, because Homer uses the name Sidonians, the Greeks must have been familiar with Phœnician merchants before the fall of Sidon, B.C. 1100, falls to the ground since the discovery that the name Sidonian was used by the coast-town Semites as a general term. Even Hiram, king of Tyre, speaks of himself in an inscription as 'King of the Sidonians' ('Corp. Inscr. Sem.' i, 5).

Granted, then, that M. Bérard may have established the existence of Phœnician settlements for mining, purple-fishing, and trading in various parts of the Ægean; granted that he has admirably explained the *raison d'être* of a Phœnician settlement at Thebes, the centre of the isthmus routes of Βοιωτία ἢ τριθάλαττος; granted that he has made very probable the reality of trade-routes across the Peloponnese, the Megarid and Bœotia, bearing traces of Semitic names; the next question is, at what period

the Phœnicians were able to establish themselves so widely. It was probably at a time when the Ægean powers were weak, and certainly when the Greeks of the mainland were weak. Was it after the first 'Achæan' invasion which gradually began to destroy the Mycenaean states, or after the later 'Dorian' invasion? Was it after the thirteenth century B.C. or after the tenth? If we choose the earlier date we are at a loss to explain the silence of the older parts of Homer and the comparative fullness of the later, and we are confronted by the numerous historical difficulties indicated above. Everything points to the later date. It is quite early enough, after all, to satisfy such expressions as the *πάλαι* and even the *τὸ πρῶτον* of Herodotus and Thucydides.

This 'Tyrian' or 'post-Sidonian' period (1000-700 B.C.) seems, from the Jewish and other Semitic accounts, to have been one of concurrent enterprises, Tyrian and Semitic on the one hand, Greek and Philistine on the other. (The Philistine cities may best be regarded as derelict Ægean colonies.) This is the time when M. Bérard's doublet nomenclature would naturally come into existence. The islands and stations frequented by Greeks and Semites would have both Greek and Semitic names, but it does not follow that the Semitic was the earlier. Where the name was indigenous it would be Pelasgian or Greek. Where the name was one given by sailors, sometimes the Greek may have come first, sometimes the Semite. In the case of Samos and of Thasos, it is worth remembering, we are definitely told by Strabo and Pliny that the Greek name was the earlier of the two. In the special case of the 'desert islands and isolated capes,' which are said by Thucydides to have been settled by 'Carians and Phœnicians,' the Semitic name was no doubt the first.

It would not be fair to criticise this book without attempting to give some idea in detail of its quality and its style of argument. For this purpose we will select the discussion of 'Odyssey' x, 80-130, the adventure with the Læstrygonians. Not that it is the best of such discussions. It has not the extreme beauty of the chapter on Circe, for instance; but it is full of new and acute observations, and it will perhaps suffer less from com-

pression than any other. Odysseus has just left the island Aiolië or Stromboli.*

'De là nous voguons au plus tôt, le cœur navré; le moral de mes hommes était brisé par le dur *travail de la rame*; grâce à notre folie il ne nous restait plus la certitude du retour. Six jours et six nuits, sans arrêt, nous naviguons. Le septième jour, nous arrivons à la ville haute de Lamos, *Télépylos de Laistrygonie*, où le berger interpelle le berger en entrant, et le berger sortant lui répond. Là un homme sans sommeil gagnerait les deux récompenses, à faire le métier de bouvier et à garder les blancs moutons, car *les chemins de la nuit et du jour sont proches*. Nous sommes venus à un port célèbre qu'encercle une margelle de pierre abrupte; à droite et à gauche, des falaises projetées se dressent face à face et s'avancent pour former la bouche; l'entrée est fort étroite. Toute ma flotte entre dans ce port creux et s'amarre en ligne; pas la moindre houle, grande ni petite; mais tout autour des vaisseaux, calme blanc. Moi seul je restai en dehors et, tout au bord du goulet, j'attachai mon navire à un rocher. Puis je montai sur une guette escarpée où je me tins debout. Rien n'était en vue; aucune trace d'humains ni de bétail; seulement, nous apercevions une fumée qui montait de la terre. J'envoyai donc mes hommes à la découverte, pour savoir quels étaient les *mangeurs de blé* de cette terre. Deux hommes, détachés avec un héraut qui les précédait, débarquèrent et, sur une route plate, par où, du sommet des montagnes, *les chars descendaient le bois vers la ville*, ils rencontrèrent une jeune fille, la forte fille du Laistrygon *Antiphates*, qui venait chercher de l'eau aux portes de la ville, et qui descendait vers la source de l'Ours au beau courant.'

The Spring of the Bear, the fountain Artakie: it is a curious name. One fountain Artakie is well known, the spring on Bear Island in the Sea of Marmora, where the town of Cyzicus once stood. But that is, from an ancient standpoint, at the other end of the world. The scholars who think that the spring near Cyzicus is meant, proceed at once to divide the story of Odysseus into two parts, an eastern wandering and a western wandering, originally separate and awkwardly joined together at this point by some simple-minded ancient editor. But is there another Bear Spring in the west, and one of

* We put in italics those words in M. Bérard's translation of which we shall have to take special notice hereafter.

sufficient importance to navigators to be recorded in the Phœnician 'Periplus'? The 'Instructions Nautiques,' in describing the Straits of Bonifacio, between Corsica and Sardinia, mention a certain Cap d'Orso.

'This cape forms the end of a bare mountain having the same name; at the summit are some prominent rocks, so disposed that they represent pretty exactly the form of a bear. Hence the name of the mountain and the cape.

A photograph of the Bear shows us that he is an unmistakable bear; and all sailors of these regions know him. But is he ancient? May he not really be due to some accidental and recent displacement of the rocks? Well, he can be traced back some two thousand years; for Ptolemy, in his handbook, mentions this particular promontory under the name of Ἀρκτου Ἀκρά, 'Bear's Point.' He is a polar bear, of hard white granite, and he was probably there, equally hard and white, a thousand years before Ptolemy.

But it is a spring, not a promontory, of the Bear that we are seeking; and this granite coast is terribly waterless. The 'Instructions' mention sedulously every little spring. As it happens, the only large ones, three, are close to the Bear, and the largest and best lies just at his feet.

'Water.—In the west angle of Parau bay there is a spring. . . . It has for long formed the water supply of the archipelago of Maddalena.'

So it did in the time of Homer, and has done always until, of late years, the island of Maddalena built artificial distilleries.

We have, then, a Bear Spring of great value to sailors and landsmen who happen to be in the neighbourhood of the Straits of Bonifacio. But are the Straits of Bonifacio themselves important enough to be recorded in a Phœnician 'Sailor's Guide'? History gives the answer. These straits form the doorway of the Italian seas, and have always been of cardinal importance to the 'thalassocrats' of various ages. From 1410 to the present day there has been a constant struggle between France, Aragon, Genoa, and Sardinia itself, for their possession; and in primitive times, apart from their great uses for war and piracy, they formed a junction of two regular

routes—east and west, between Italy and Spain, north and south, between Sicily or the Lipari islands and such stations as Marseilles and Monaco. The Bear Spring would be likely to find mention in all guides for sailors travelling from the east.

But there was also a 'famous haven,' and one of a peculiar shape: a long 'hollow harbour,' with a 'very narrow entrance,' surrounded by a 'shore of steep unbroken rock'; also we hear, in a later passage, that it had 'much deep water inside.' Now most of Sardinia is very ill-provided with harbours or anchorages; but just in the neighbourhood of the Bear there are several. The coast is a series of refuges for ships. The one that would first appeal to mariners coming from Stromboli is Porto Pozzo, the 'Pit,' as it is called from its depth and narrowness between high granite sides. Between the high conical hill, Monte Rosso, and the island 'delle Vacche,' say the 'Instructions,'

'lies a long, narrow arm of the sea, called Porto Pozzo. The entrance is less than two cables broad.* It grows larger inside. . . . It is nearly two miles long. Though the entry is open to the north, there is never much sea inside. At the entry of this arm of the sea the rock or reef Colombo is situated, a cable and a half from the nearest land.'

The description suits: the rocky sides, the narrow entrance, the absence of swell inside, the long narrow shape. The 'guette escarpée' is there too; for Monte Rosso is one of a series of 'guardie' or watch-points from which the natives of this pirate-ridden and fish-eating land kept watch for their enemies and their prey. Lastly, Odysseus's scouts went along 'a level road whereby the wains drew down timber from the high mountains to the town.' The end of Porto Pozzo is sandy marsh, leading to the gently rising valley of the Liscia, which forms the easiest road to the mountains; and the forests of Sardinia have always, down to the last century, formed a great source of timber for the ships of Spain, Provence, and Italy. On the west side, it is true, the difficulties of carriage almost prevented the trade till the advent of modern engineering; but on the north 'the slopes of

* ἀραιὴ δ' εἰσοδὸς ἔστιν. (Od. x, 90.)

the Gallura and the valley of Liscia make a natural road, which the waggons of the natives must have followed at all times.'

We need not follow the special reasons for rejecting other ports which would suit our passage almost as well as Porto Pozzo: none would suit quite so well. But let us look for further details of agreement. The most conspicuous objects to a ship coasting from the east along this shore will be, first, Bear Point, next, perhaps, Il Colombo, the 'Rock of Doves.' Is there any trace of this last in Homer? One would expect it, for small islands near a coast, especially a coast of unfriendly natives, were of the utmost importance to primitive mariners. Cases have been given where a whole land bore a name derived from an island or rock of curious shape that had become a mark to sailors. Coreyra ('ship') was perhaps so called from the reef 'la barchetta'; Cythera-Scandeia from its mitre-shaped rock (above, p. 356). After all, what does the name Laistrygonia mean? Scholars talk of the intensive prefix *λα-* and of some root *τρυγ-*, whence *τρύχων*, etc., 'very-devouring land.' But is it not simpler to take *lâas*, *λεύς* or *λαῖς*, a 'stone' or 'rock,' and *τρυγονίη*, the adjective from *τρυγών*, dove, so that the name simply means 'Doves' Rock'? Then the whole region of almost unknown and untrodden mainland opposite the Doves' Rock was simply 'the region of the Doves' Rock.' It is now the province of Gallura. The whole coast is, as a matter of fact, alive with pigeons; all holes, caves, deserted buildings, are filled with their nests and their noise. There are two places called 'Colombo' now on the north coast, and two called 'Falcone'; for the doves, who have for ages nested on these rocks, have had with them always their hereditary enemies the hawks.

The harbourage behind Doves' Rock was nearly perfect. But in the land of the bloodthirsty Læstrygones a deep harbour became a mere trap. Odysseus himself knew well that it was better to be troubled by surf and fear of storms than to venture inside such a harbour. The scouts were led by the daughter of Antiphates to the high house of her father. They saw his monstrous queen, and shuddered. Word was sent to Antiphates himself, in the 'agora'; and he devised for the strangers a cruel death. He seized and tore one man: the others fled.

'Then he made a cry through the city, and the valiant Læstrygones gathered in their thousands, more like giants than men, and from the top of the cliffs hurled great rocks, each of them a man's burden, upon the Greeks; and anon there arose from the fleet an evil din of men dying and ships shattered withal. Then, harpooning my men like fishes, they bore them away for a loathsome feast.'

There is nothing in this tale to contradict our identification; but at first sight there would seem to be nothing that could possibly confirm it. Yet, if we know the Homeric method, there is something. We find in other instances that the poet had a way of drawing into his narrative phrases, allusions, or even stories, suggested by various peculiarities of the places or neighbourhoods mentioned in the Phœnician 'Guide.' The Achæans were 'harpooned like fish, and carried off for food.' There is practically only one fish in the Mediterranean that is harpooned and carried off for food, the tunny or albacore; and, when Æschylus describes the destruction of the shipwrecked Persians at Salamis, he compares them specifically to tunnies. Now the tunny-fishing is the great event of every summer in Sardinia, and amounts to the national sport. From April onward two men are always stationed on watch-points looking out for the tunnies. When they are seen, then 'there is made a cry through the city, and the valiant Læstrygones gather from all sides in their thousands.' The vast trap with seven chambers, *mandraga*, has been prepared beforehand. The fish are driven farther and farther in till they are in the last or 'death' chamber. Then the net is dragged up towards the surface of the water. It rises slowly, crowded with its almost solid burden of fish, the best specimens being ten feet long, and weighing over a thousand pounds. Then comes the word '*ammazza*,' 'kill,' and there follows the harpooning of the thousands of immense struggling monsters, till the sea is covered with red foam, and the men and women are drunk with butchery. Further scenes follow, ending with a 'loathsome feast,' which La Marmora, from whom the above is taken, shrinks from describing. There is no book about Sardinia which does not devote some pages to the description of this tunny-fishery. Is it, perhaps, some such

description that suggested to Homer the harpooning of Odysseus's men?

Nor is this all. Was there not also another very small but important detail in the 'Guide,' which has reappeared in the incident of Odysseus waiting outside the harbour, 'with his cables fastened in a rock'? The lowest point of Corsica, on the other side of this strait, is called Pertusato, the 'pierced rock.' In Sardinia itself, just to the south of Pertusato, is Porto Longone, or Longo Sardo. One thinks at first that it is so called because it is a long headland. But it already bore the name 'Longones' in the itinerary of Antoninus; and 'longones,' λογγῶνες, are perfectly definite things—'the pierced stones in harbours, which they pierce in order to fasten the cables of ships in them.' So says the 'Etymologicum Magnum.' It looks as if there had been such 'pierced stones' here from the remotest antiquity. The mention of them in the 'Guide' would be just enough to suggest to the poet to make Odysseus use one.

Bear Spring, Dove Rock, deep narrow harbour, watch-point, road to the mountain, timber waggons, harpooning place, and pierced stone—it seems that this Sardinian coast gives us all the sites, and, at the same time, all the incidents of this Homeric adventure. Let us take it that Odysseus's men landed at Porto Pozzo. They must have gone up the only existing natural road toward the high ground; for of course, in these early ages, the city of Antiphates was built on high ground away from the sea. It must have been in much the same position as the modern capital of the province of Gallura—Tempio, but, unless the 'Sailor's Guide' was inaccurate—as it often was about inland matters—a good deal nearer to the sea. From Tempio there is but one possible road seaward, as far as a place called Luogo Santo. There the road divides, the left branch going to the upper end of Porto Pozzo, the right to the Spring of the Bear. The Greeks must have met the princess somewhere above Luogo Santo. Telepylos must have been a place rather like Tempio, if the common derivation of its name, 'big-gated,' is correct. Gallura is a land of granite, and the primitive buildings are largely composed of enormous granite blocks. Besides, there are curious remains of early ages; stones seven yards high, bearing such names as 'Perda Lunga,' 'Long Stone';

tombs of giants, of which the name is 'Perda Latta' or 'Nouraga.' These last have very low and massive doors. Did Antiphates live in a Nouraga?

Lastly, the geographical position of the Bear's Cape suits accurately with the Homeric account of the voyage from Stromboli. Odysseus and his men arrived there on the seventh day after leaving the isle of Æolus. Presumably they followed the coasts in the ancient manner. They would go either by the Italian coast up to Monte Circeo and then across to the straits, or else by Didyme and Ustica to the south of Sardinia and then up the Sardinian coast. In either case the distance would be about eight hundred or nine hundred kilometres. In fair weather a Homeric ship would never have taken a week over such a voyage. But then Homer specially tells us that the weather was not fair. 'The men's spirit was worn out with weary labour at the oar.' The poet had evidently learnt from his 'Guide' the fact that north winds are predominant in these waters. In the circumstances a week was just about the right time.

Now, unless this summary of the argument has been very inadequate, a reader must feel almost dazzled by the brilliancy of the above identification. The words of Homer are so closely understood and so constantly kept in relation with real fact; the reasoning is so original, so little influenced by ordinary scholastic methods, so replete with surprise after surprise; and there is in the French such a charm of style, such dexterity, such—the truth will out—such consummate cunning amid such apparent candour. M. Bérard is a real artist, almost a poet; and his book, as it lies before us now, surrounded by ordinary works of sound learning, wears the unprincipled and seductive air of a Tannhäuser among the Minnesingers. Observe the calm way in which, without a word of argument, he translates 'Artakie,' 'the Spring of the Bear,' as if we all knew that; whereas in truth we know nothing of the kind. He does, indeed, give a reference to 'Paully-Wissowa, s.v. Kyzikos'; but their article on Cyzicus (not 'Kyzikos') contains no mention of the derivation in question. 'Bear' is *ἄρκτος*, not *ἄρτος*. The *κ* is part of the root: the *τ* is not. No derivative is known which drops the *κ*, though a few drop the *τ*: e.g. Arkonesos = Arktonesos, and Arkobadara, said to mean

'Bärensprung.' It is still possible that dissimilation from the ensuing κ may have caused 'Ἀρκτακίη to change into 'Ἀρτακίη; and it is a fact that the island of Cyzicus, in which the spring was, bore the name 'Ἀρκτων Νῆσος, 'Isle of Bears.' This is something, but not much. Considering the immense frequency of names beginning with 'Arto' all along the Asiatic coasts, the probability is that 'Arkton Nesos' is a mere rough Grecising of some native and unintelligible name, a name which remained untranslated in Artake and Artakie, Artakoi and Artakioi. If M. Bérard had only argued this question openly he would have had readers ready—nay, quite unduly anxious—to agree with him. It will be a real sorrow to lose faith in the Bear.

It is almost the same with the Doves' Rock, *Λαιστρυγονίη*. We are told to derive it from *lâas*, *λεύς* or *λαῖς*, 'a stone,' and the adjective *τρυγονίη*, which is used by Oppian. Now there is a word *lâas*, and there is a word *λεύς*, which are not what we want. What we want is the third form, *λαῖς*. There is no such word. We tacitly assume it, and pass on.

In points of strict scholarship also the book is not impeccable. The piece of translation quoted above has a certain dashing looseness running through it. In vol. ii we have noted, on p. 235, the hypothetical adjective *τηλὸς* treated as if it were as real as *μακρὸς*. On p. 452 *σύβοτος* is proposed as an emendation for *βούβοτος*, without any mention of the *prima facie* difference of quantity. On p. 556 *κλειστόν* is suggested as a possible variant for *κλυτόν*, in utter defiance of metre. It is much rarer to find a lapse from common-sense in argument. M. Bérard has a strong head, and is seldom intoxicated by his own speculations. Yet such lapses do occur.

It would be mere blindness of admiration to deny the existence of blemishes such as these. The whole work, as is natural considering its vast range and its wealth of suggestion, has many faults as well as many merits. But the faults are such as one finds in many books; the merits are quite individual, and indeed extraordinary.

GILBERT MURRAY.

Art. III. — HIPPOLYTE TAINE, PHILOSOPHER AND CRITIC.

1. *Hippolyte Taine; sa Vie et sa Correspondance*. Vols. I and II. Paris: Hachette, 1902-4.
2. *Life and Letters of H. Taine, 1828-1870*. Translated by Mrs R. L. Devonshire. Two vols. Westminster: Constable, 1902-4.

THE publication of Taine's letters is an event of special interest to Englishmen. The historian of English literature, the author of the 'Notes sur l'Angleterre,' the admirer of English society, the friendly critic of English institutions and manners, deserves neglect at our hands least of all; and we, as well as the nation of his birth, have cause for much gratitude to Madame Taine, in thus supplying his admirers, the whole body of those liberally interested in literature, art, and psychology, with this self-drawn portrait of a great mind.* Few men have possessed an intellect so logical and acute, an imagination so vivid and consecutive, a sensibility so tender and refined; and, although he cannot be held to have laid to rest the questions with which he dealt, yet his influence has been profound. Perhaps more completely than any other man, he typified in his own person the varied mental life of the half-century which has just closed.

But Taine's life has another and intrinsic value. It has a unity which we often find in the lives of philosophers and scientists; but it has also a completeness which is almost unique. The early part of his life was spent in the search for abstract truth; he gave as little of himself as he could to the sordid affairs of practical life; his teaching, with the exception of his lectures on art, was the analogue of Spinoza's lenses. Like Spinoza, he never thought, never cared to think, how his theories might affect existing things. He did not know whether he was a conservative or a revolutionist. The chief aim of his work was to resume all the sciences into a single science, a single formula. This involved a certain superficiality, but it gave him a lofty outlook over life. When

* The translation by Mrs Devonshire is, in general, both accurate and well written. That it has the charm of the original cannot be said, and will hardly be expected.

he had found his formula, when he had tested it in many ways, when he had at last convinced himself that he had definitely grasped the essential nature of man and his intelligence, he turned, as no other abstract thinker had ever quite done, to actual life. He devoted the fruit of half a life-time's thought to his country; he spent the rest of his life in the endeavour to determine what was the wisest course of action for the men who surrounded him; and he died with this last task incomplete. As he himself had said with happy premonition when, scarcely more than a boy, he was planning out his life:

'Action will have its place, but at the proper time, and when I know how to act; social philosophy will be for me the commentary and corollary of the philosophy of history and of metaphysics.' ('Vie,' i, 82.)

Hippolyte-Adolphe Taine was born at Vouziers, in the Ardennes, in 1828. His family belonged to the solid middle class, which, in this case, at least, does not seem to have been at all lacking in general culture. It is, perhaps, somewhat chimerical to attempt to deduce the general basis of his mind from the mixture of races that inhabit the district in which his family had long been settled; but we may trace a general resemblance between Taine and the people among whom his ancestors had lived. Michelet has a passage of great interest in this connexion. In his description of the Ardennes, he says:

'The race is strongly marked; it has something more than usual of intelligence, sobriety, and thrift. These people's faces are dry, as it were, and rough-hewn. This characteristic of dryness and severity is by no means peculiar to the little Geneva of Sedan. It is the same almost everywhere. The country is not rich, and the enemy is near at hand. That makes people think.'

Taine's early childhood was placid and happy. Looking back, he must have remembered an almost ideal home, with its calm, regular and modest life, as M. Giraud has so truly said, uniting labour and tenderness, and inspiring the sweet familiarity of domestic life with intellectual joys and interests.

'What famous river,' he wrote many years after, 'equals the little stream where for the first time you saw the ripples

interweaving their arabesques, fringed with silver at the touch of a drooping willow branch? What noble park surpasses the charm of the poor meadow where you have paused in childhood to pick the convolvulus or buttercup?' ('Derniers Essais,' p. 43, *et seq.*)

His father died in 1840; and, although the boy was too young to feel very profoundly, the grief of others seems to have made a deep impression upon him. He had no brothers; but his sisters, and above all his mother, were supremely dear companions. They remained so throughout. In after-life, when he was living in a provincial town, with no congenial friend near, he wrote to his mother: 'I am tired, but can find nothing so refreshing as your memory.' Before his father's death he had been sent to a boarding-school at Rethel, kept by an old priest and his sister. But it was soon decided to seek some more regular instruction for the boy; and he was entered at a school in Paris, where his mother soon came to live, at her father's house in Les Batignolles. From this time onward, until his entrance to the École Normale, Taine lived with her and his sisters, working as few English boys work, with an excursion to the Forest of Saint-Germain, a visit to the Louvre, or a swimming lesson from his uncles, as his chief amusements.

When he was just twenty, a few months before he entered the great training school, he wrote an account of his intellectual life during the previous five years, which is remarkable for the self-knowledge and meditative spirit which it displays.

'There are certain minds,' he writes, 'which live shut up in themselves, whose passion, sorrow, joy, and action are all internal. I am of their number; and, if I should desire to review my life, I could only recall the changes, the uncertainties, and the progress of my thought. If I write this now, it is in order that I may find it later, and know then what I was at this time.'

Here, already, is that preoccupation with the phenomena of the mind which was to show itself so strongly afterwards. He goes on to describe an early religious crisis; and it is pathetic to find this scarcely-trained, precocious intellect confusing itself with questions which maturity

cannot solve. He entered early on the long labour of thought.

'What fell first was my religious faith. One doubt provoked another; each belief dragged another down in its fall. . . . I valued my reason too highly to believe in any other authority. . . . I grew angry with the virtue which springs from fear and the belief which arises from obedience. . . . Pride and love of liberty set me free.'

The next three years, he tells us, were spent in the search for general truths, in efforts to grasp the totality of things, to know what men and society really are.

'I went to the extreme limit of doubt. . . . I was sad then. . . . I had denied the authority of that reason which I prized so highly. . . . Then, wearied out with contradictions, I devoted myself to the service of the newest and most poetical hypothesis; I defended pantheism with all my might. . . . That was my salvation. Thenceforward metaphysics appeared intelligible, and science serious. I arrived, by dint of seeking, at a height from which I could embrace the whole philosophical horizon. . . . I set to work with eagerness; the clouds broke; I understood the origin of my errors; I saw the unity and the totality of the universe. . . .' ('Vie,' i, 20 *et sqq.*)

In November 1848 he was admitted, first of his year, to the École Normale. The Revolution of '48 seems to have made little impression upon him, certainly none at all comparable with that made by the *coup d'état* of 1851, or by the insurrection of the Commune; and he entered the School with a mind devoted to high philosophical speculations. His first experience of collegiate life seems to have been unfavourable. It was the first time that he had been really separated from his family. 'I have no friend at the School,' he writes; 'a great sadness and great hopes overwhelm me.' There was no one to whom he could speak in this 'moral solitude' of the thoughts which lay nearest to his heart.

This first experience of men coincided with the beginning of a certain pessimism, so common in early manhood, which never quite deserted him.

'Amid the immeasurable disgust and discouragement which assailed me,' he wrote to his early friend, Prévost-Paradol, 'I should have given way except for beliefs supported by a few

powerful arguments. I needed these fixed points to steady me in that tremendous fall which everyone who has been brought up on learning and art must experience when he sees for the first time the world, life, and that sad, vast tract of thirty or forty years which he has still to pass through before he can end his toil, and sleep.' ('Vie,' i, 47.)

Already he had found the narcotic quality of thought, and fingered that 'unconquerable breviary, I mean the geometry of things.'

In spite of hours of weariness and depression, he continued to work with extraordinary eagerness and assiduity, studying history, literature, and philosophy, independently of his regular courses of reading; and, in spite too of his constant labour, he found time to cultivate friendships, with Prévost-Paradol, his old friend of the Collège Bourbon, Édouard de Suckau, and Edmond About, in particular. He used to join in *trios* of Mozart and Beethoven; and in his more serious moments of leisure he would discuss all sorts of subjects, literary, religious, social, philosophic, with that eagerness and independence so characteristic of young minds as yet undulled by life.

Amid such occupations Taine's three years passed away very pleasantly, very profitably. At his entrance in 1848 the School had been frankly liberal, under the direction of M. Dubois and M. Vacherot. It seemed for a time as if it was to remain an oasis of free thought amid the reaction which began in 1850. But Taine himself was to be made a scape-goat. In 1851 he presented himself in the regular course for the *agrégation* in philosophy. To the surprise of all, of his masters as much as of his fellow-students, he was refused. The cause of this failure would seem to have been that the study of Spinoza and Hegel, combined with his own audacity of thought, gave rise in his papers to ideas which seemed revolutionary to the adherents of the official philosophy. 'You love the ideas which you have discovered for yourself so much,' he wrote a few years later, 'that you cannot help thinking aloud.' He must have thought aloud; and his ideas alarmed the jury. The president, Portalis, reported that 'his lesson had been a revelation against the teaching of the School, and that it was impossible to get rid too soon of professors who formed such pupils.' For the time being, thought,

so far as was possible, was going to be restrained within certain limits. When Taine soon afterwards criticised the 'authoritative philosophy' of Royer-Collard and Victor Cousin, and demanded that the single aim of science and education should be the disinterested propagation and discovery of the truth, he was vindicating modern ideals on whose behalf he himself had suffered.

In spite of the consolations which his friends and masters attempted to give him, his refusal must have been a severe blow. The following year was to be fertile in disappointments and labour. Mainly through the kind offices of M. Guizot, he was appointed to fill a temporary vacancy of the chair of philosophy at Nevers.

'At least, in being a professor,' he had written to Paradol early in his school career, 'I shall be free for all but eight hours a week; when I lecture I shall be occupied with matters of pure thought, lofty and free from all the sordidness of practical life. . . . Forced to sell myself, I sell as little of myself as I can, and I will try to live with what remains over to me.' ('Vie,' i, 90.)

He entered hopefully on his duties at Nevers in October 1851. He worked at his thesis on sensations, the first rude sketch of the 'De l'Intelligence.' He studied Hegel anew; he shrank from society, in order to plunge himself in his beloved philosophy and psychology.

'There would be plenty of houses open to me if I cared about them. But I scarcely do; I enjoy solitude and liberty too much. . . . I bury myself in philosophy, and (forgive the impertinence) I find myself good enough company not to be bored when alone.' ('Ib. i, 141.)

He was happy when he could feel that 'his own observations were pushing him every day towards more definite theories and more original formulas,' and that 'the more he lived the more he became himself.' (Ib. i, 162.)

But the sordidness of practical life would intrude. In November 1851 there came the *coup d'état*. The student of pure ideas must always find much to disgust him in practical politics, in the love of compromise, the short-sightedness, the self-seeking of politicians. They disgusted Taine.

'Right' (he says) 'counts for nothing; there are only passions and interests. . . . Only science, literature, education, the slow

progress of ideas, can drag us out of the mire. I must resign myself for many years to being of no party, hating them all, and eagerly longing for the victory of the only one that can be followed, the party of science and honour. . . . Napoleon, the Bourbons, Louis-Philippe, M. Louis Napoleon, are but so many compromises born of circumstances. Ideas themselves in '89 and '48 only reigned by accident and for a moment.' ('Vie,' i, 168, 171.)

It maddened him to hear men, who had been pouring out insults against Louis Napoleon, say they would vote for him because otherwise they would lose their places. It was still worse to hear such conduct elevated to the rank of principles. 'How hideous politics are!' he exclaims—'La laide chose que la politique!'

He was to be brought for a time into still closer contact with this unlovely side of things. The rector of the college sent round a circular letter approving of the *coup d'état*, for signature by the professors.

'I refused,' Tainé wrote to his sister Virginie a couple of days after. 'I did not wish to enter on my professorship with cowardice and falsehood. It is my duty to teach respect of the laws, fidelity to oaths, the worship of eternal Right; I should have been ashamed to approve of perjury, usurpation, and murder.' (Ib. i, 176.)

Strange to say, he does not seem to have suffered owing to his courageous refusal.

Nor were these his only sources of disquietude. His sensibility was too delicate for him to be able to live among uncongenial people without severe suffering. His last months at Nevers were marked by a profound depression, which arose in great part from his loneliness, partly also, no doubt, from his constant habits of overwork. 'The conversation of the people who surround me is intolerable; I can speak of neither lofty nor intimate things. But I still prefer my free and lonely weariness to the constrained weariness of society.' At the end of March 1852 he was transferred to another temporary vacancy at Poitiers, this time in *rhétorique*, not philosophy. As the Minister of Public Instruction, Fortoul, wrote to him, it was a course of instruction 'less perilous to his future.' Although in his lectures at Nevers he had endeavoured to shelter himself behind

famous names quoted by the orthodox, it was of little more use than Luther's quoting St Augustine. He remained at Poitiers until the end of the summer. His mind seems to have been somewhat easier.

'For the last eight months disillusionments have fallen so thickly and have made such progress that I am beginning to understand Spinoza's practice as well as his theories. . . . To think, to arrange your thoughts, to write your thoughts, is delicious; the less you think of the public the happier you are.' ('Vie,' i, 234.)

The thoughts which it was such pleasure to think and arrange and write were, of course, his psychological theories, which were being set in order for his doctor's thesis. But these theories involved such startling departures from official psychology that Garnier, one of the judges, concluded that he had 'too much imagination for philosophy, and that he would find in literature and poetry more legitimate and fortunate employment for his brilliant qualities.' Hegelianism in any form was regarded as dangerous; and Tainé had studied and assimilated Spinoza and Hegel too thoroughly for him to avoid the unconscious expression of a philosophy similar to theirs. The establishment of the Empire marked the beginning of a period of repression in the state educational machine. Tainé was not allowed to give his pupils permission to read 'Les Provinciales,' 'L'École des Maris,' or Lamartine. The German philosophers might only be studied *en cachette*. 'Our history is that of Julien at the seminary,' he says, referring to his favourite novelist, Stendhal.

Tainé himself had no scruples in taking the oaths to Napoleon. 'I refused to approve on December 2,' he wrote to his mother; 'his action was unjust and illegal and violated my great principle of the sovereignty of the nation. But now this man has a legitimate power, conferred by the general will.' Many of his friends, however, found themselves obliged to resign all connexion with official teaching, as he himself was to do shortly. 'All my friends are ruined,' he wrote. 'One can only curl oneself up in a hole and live like a rat-philosopher.'

In August his term at Poitiers was up. There was no possibility of an *agrégation* in philosophy; and his

psychological thesis had been rejected. As some sort of consolation, he was slowly forming that plan of the treatise, 'De l'Intelligence,' which for nearly twenty years was never quite out of his thoughts. But for the moment he had need of all his courage. The appointment which was offered him at the *lycée* of Besançon was impossible for one who was selling as little of himself as he could help, and furthermore would have involved too great a tax on his nerves. 'I shiver with horror,' he wrote, 'at the thought of ten classes a week of fifty grumbling, grunting, stamping urchins. I was not made to be a tamer of wild beasts.' He went up to Paris, demanded a temporary release from his duties (*congé de disponibilité*), and set to work to find private lessons sufficient to supply his slender wants while he accomplished the programme which he had traced out for himself—the writing of his doctor's theses, in French on La Fontaine, and in Latin 'De Personis Platoniciis,' and the serious pursuit of his studies in psychology. His plans were conceived with courage, but their execution seemed at times above his strength.

'Will is not lacking; I don't think it ever will be; but perhaps something is broken in my moral machine; this "something" is hope. I am beginning to see life as it is, to understand what it is to get on in the world, or to introduce a new idea into it.' ('Vie,' i, 310.)

But in spite of momentary depression and hesitation he worked on bravely, writing his theses, attending lectures in physiology and geology, studying anatomy, and visiting the wards of the Salpêtrière, where one of his relations, Dr Baillarger, was chief physician. This time he succeeded. He received his degree in May 1853.

But he was not yet satisfied. His next work was the Academy prize. The subject was Livy; and for the following six months, in addition to his scientific studies, he was reading at the libraries and collecting notes for his new enterprise. 'I pass my days at it,' he wrote to his mother, 'only coming out for meals or just to shake hands with Suckau or Planat.' The greater part of his time Suckau himself was lecturing at Bourges; and Tainé's closest friends were Woepke and Planat—the Marcellin of the 'Vie Parisienne.' These were the

leaders of the 'five or six young men who loved reading, who passed their days in libraries and dissecting rooms, and amused their evenings with argument,' of whom we read in the '*Philosophes Classiques*.' The result of his diligence was that *Livy* was finished at the end of the year, but at the expense of much weariness. 'I curse the time I have put into it, the day I conceived it, the day I shall be delivered of it,' he wrote half seriously, half jestingly. He had a severe attack of laryngitis, from the effects of which he suffered for the next two years. To recruit from it he visited some of the watering-places in southern France. The result was one of his most charming books, the '*Voyage aux Eaux des Pyrénées*,' his first without an academical origin.

But the earlier part of 1854 was melancholy indeed. In January he had presented his study on *Livy* to the Academy, which, after long discussion, decided to put the prize off till the next year. He was reproached with lack of respect for *Livy* and great men in general, with heaviness of style, with too great an inclination to modern historical ideas. He wrote to Guillaume Guizot, the historian's son, who had been unlucky enough to congratulate him prematurely:—

'You recognise the fortune of Carthage. As a matter of fact, when you announced my success to me, I was quite astonished, being unaccustomed to such events. I thought that Fortune had made a mistake in my favour. You see that she has quickly corrected her clumsiness.' ('*Vie*,' ii, 59.)

His friends urged him to rewrite his essay. For a short time he hesitated. He knew, he said, that his offspring was lame, but, if he had rightly understood the Academy's criticisms, he would have to break its sound leg also. On reading it over he found it dull. He turned its pages with an effort of will, not from interest. The execution was of that respectable mediocrity which he disliked in others but detested in himself. But with final courage he made up his mind to recast it, and by a supreme effort to change the fortune of Carthage. It must have needed great resolution in his state of health. His doctor forbade him all sorts of work; and he was thrown back on Voltaire and Beyle, two writers of whom he never tired. About the middle of July he set out on

his trip to the Pyrénées. He went to Saint-Sauveur and then to Eaux-bonnes. There he spent his time between reading 'Faust' and climbing rocks, 'leading the life' (he said) 'of a Pythagorean goat.' He went back to Paris, but slightly better, however, and spent the rest of the year in making descriptions, dialogues, and fantastic Pyrenean diabolical legends for his 'Voyage,' which was published by Hachette in April 1855.

It was at this period that his literary career really began. His connexion with Hachette opened to him the 'Revue de l'Instruction Publique'; and soon afterwards he began to contribute to the 'Revue des Deux Mondes' and the 'Journal des Débats.' From this time onwards there appeared his remarkable series of essays, some of which were republished in the 'Essais de Critique et d'Histoire.' In May the Academy crowned his *Livry*. Thenceforward he received no serious check from anything but ill-health. In July he was at Eaux-bonnes again on account of his throat and frequent neuralgia. Natural objects always delighted him, and he looked on them with no undiscerning eye.

'To-day, after having watched the mountain behind which the sun was setting, I discovered that it was the energy of its black colour which gave to the long, broken line the life which pleased me so. The rocky mass *existed* only because this blackness was extreme, and increased as it arose against the pure, soft blue of the West. It emerged from the common ordinary state. It assumed a threatening appearance; it seemed invincible, immovable; it drew my eyes to it, and crushed all that surrounded it. . . . Colour, then, is the passion of inanimate objects. . . . The opposition of tints makes, not bouquets, but tragedies.' ('Vie,' ii, 104.)

When he came back to Paris he began to write his articles on the official philosophy, published as the 'Philosophes Classiques.'

'My third misfortune is M. Cousin,' he wrote, apologising for a long silence. 'I have buried myself in that man; . . . and I have written five enormous articles, which will come out in the "Revue de l'Instruction." I was given complete liberty, and I have made use of it.' (Ib. ii, 111.)

Cousin must have reflected bitterly on Taine's 'lack of veneration for great men' when he found himself dis-

sected as a beetle is by an entomologist. If it was bad when Livy was explained as an 'orator who made an historian of himself,' what was it when he, the great Cousin, was explained as 'an orator who made himself a philosopher!' These articles attracted much attention; and their appearance in book-form led to wide discussion of the merits of the doctrines which they expressed. At last Taine was definitely placed 'out of the crowd'; Sainte-Beuve honoured him with a couple of articles; he had no more to fear from recalcitrant editors.

In the meantime the idea of his 'History of English Literature' had been gradually springing up. At first he had intended to do no more than a study of Shakespeare's psychology, which he had proposed to Hachette so early as 1854; but his researches had led him further than he had expected. In January 1856 he wrote: 'I think I have been unwise to undertake this history of English literature. It is too long a road by which to arrive at philosophy. It is like going to Versailles by way of Strassburg.' It was, indeed, a long road; he devoted seven years of his life to his English studies; but philosophy was to be found, not only at the end of his journey, but all the way along his path. The 'History of English Literature' is a great experiment in philosophy, in the sense of the disengagement of the broad general principles underlying human life.

The first half of this period was unhappily marked by such ill-health as effectually forbade all connected work and thought, except at rare intervals. He writes to his friend Suckau, for instance:—

'I am very far from being well, as you guessed; I work from two to three hours in the morning, with great precautions; the rest of the time I rub myself with cold water, I sleep, I sit long over my meals, I pay a few visits, and I give one or two rare lessons; I go to bed at nine, and I only go into society in cases of extreme necessity.' ('Vie,' ii, 162.)

It was the severest trial he had had or was to have; and the patience with which he bore it is sufficient evidence of the sweetness of his true strength.

'I am a steam-engine without a boiler,' he wrote, pathetically enough; 'and I am rusting or rotting out. . . . I live oyster-wise; I give no more lessons; I avoid thought and

conversation; I can only shake your hand. My condition and outlook at first made me very sad; but I moralised for a while, and now have recovered my balance.' ('Vie,' ii, 181.)

Happily the crisis passed, and by the beginning of 1860 he was at work once more rewriting '*La Fontaine*' and advancing with his '*Littérature Anglaise*.' However he realised how inadequate mere book knowledge was. Three years before he had written to Suckau, who was about to visit England: 'I envy you your journey; you will see with your bodily eyes what I have been compelled to guess at.' In June 1860 he paid us his first visit. His early impressions are not uninteresting.

'This great London tires and saddens me; I am actively fulfilling my duties as anatomist, but that is all. Everything is too big, too dark, too crowded together; everywhere you see the results of overmuch work and effort. The very contrasts wound me.' (Ib. ii, 200.)

A little later he wrote to M. Guillaume Guizot:—

'All I will say is that I am beginning to value literature and the information which it can give. I think that the judgments which it suggested to me at Paris were not false. Actual experience has not falsified the expectations of the study; it has confirmed them, made them more precise, developed them; but the general formulas remain, in my opinion, quite true. I conclude that the opinions which we may form on ancient Greece and Rome, on Italy, Spain, and England, of the Renaissance, are exact, and that an historian possesses in books a very powerful instrument, a sort of faithful photography almost always capable of replacing the physical sight of objects.' (Ib. ii, 204.)

In the same letter he endeavours to remove a popular misconception.

'There is a point on which I must try to refute you; your article in the "*Débats*" spoke of English stiffness. You seem to think that each man is surrounded by a sort of hedge which cuts him off from his neighbours. Well, for my part I have found them as affable and communicative as the French. I am not speaking only of those to whom you have given me introductions. They may have been agreeable for your sake or out of good breeding. But everywhere, on the boat and in the omnibus, in town and country, people seem to me polite

and friendly. I have asked my way hundreds of times in the streets, and they have always told me, and even put themselves to some trouble over it. . . . I do not find them more melancholy than the French; they are certainly as civil. On the whole, I think they have stronger nerves than we have; they are less emotional, fonder of coarse pleasures, noise, and physical enjoyment.'

This was only the first of a series of visits which he paid us, returning with note-books full of varied observations, selections from which his friends persuaded him to publish as the '*Notes sur l'Angleterre*.' In connexion with the select contents of these note-books, it is curious to compare England, as seen by Taine in the nineteenth century, with that seen by Voltaire, whom Taine admired so much, in the eighteenth. To each we offered a political ideal with which each endeavoured to indoctrinate his countrymen; but by a strange irony the two ideals were very far apart. To Voltaire England seemed the paradise of Liberalism. While he was still smarting from the stripes of the Chevalier de Rohan's servants, he saw a society where men of letters were not cudgelled but caressed, not put in the Bastille but given offices of state. He saw the royal barge on the Thames followed by a crowd of wherries, and 'not one of the watermen but showed, in face, garb, and figure, that he was free and living amid plenty.' In the political world he especially notices that noblemen have no legal authority in the places from which they take their titles, and that, 'because a man is a noble or a priest, he is not therefore exempt from paying taxes; all the taxes are regulated by the House of Commons, which, although the second in rank, is the first in importance.'

To Taine, on the other hand, just arrived from the '*pays de l'égalité*' of the nineteenth century, England seemed the paradise of Conservatism. He finds the people accepting the decisions of authority without question. He never wearies of describing the great country-houses and their magnificent surroundings, the care of the owners for their dependents, and the respect of the villagers for their hereditary leaders. 'The upper classes' (he writes) 'have performed their duties well; and, in local as in national life, their ascendancy is deserved and uncontested' ('*Notes*,' p. 215). For him the

essential fact was a continuity of life which had never broken with its traditions. Speaking of the benefactors of Oxford, he says:—

'These old men seem still living, for their work survives them and endures. . . . This is not a dead or sleeping city; the modern completes and magnifies the ancient work; the men of to-day, as of old, add their buildings and their gifts. . . . We have destroyed and been compelled to build anew from the foundation. Here the following generation does not break with its predecessor; reforms are grafted on institutions, and the present, supported by the past, continues it.' ('Notes,' 168.)

Here, too, is profound truth; yet what a difference between 1727 and 1860!

At times, unhappily, he still had to give up work; in one of these intervals of enforced rest he attempted his unfinished novel, 'Étienne Mayran.'

'I have written twenty pages of a novel which will be finished or not as heaven wills. . . . I believe that every cultivated and intelligent man, by collecting his experiences, could make one or two good novels, for, in fact, a novel is only a collection of experiences.' ('Vie,' ii, 209.)

The story, we are told, is that of a poor orphan of precocious intellect and morbid sensibility; and the completed portion, his school life, is full of reminiscences of Taine's own early days, mingled with suggestions of Julien Sorel at his seminary. We can only regret that the work was given up. Very likely it would not have been an artistic success, but it would have been as interesting to the psychologist as the 'Volupté' of Sainte-Beuve. At this time, when he was frequenting drawing-rooms, 'as he would frequent dissecting-rooms,' with the object of studying for his novel, Taine lived somewhat less as a recluse than before. He was in touch with the literary and artistic world; he was often at the dinners at Magny's, where Sainte-Beuve presided; Édouard Bertin, the artist and director of the 'Débats,' Renan, Berlioz, Flaubert, and many other well-known men, were among his friends and acquaintances; he was a welcome visitor in the political *salon* of M. Guizot, the literary *salon* of the Comtesse d'Haussonville, and the cosmopolitan assemblies of Princess Mathilde. So when, in 1863, his

friend Planat founded the '*Vie Parisienne*,' the '*Notes sur Paris*' published in it, under the pseudonym of Frederic Thomas Graindorge, were the fruit of keen and varied observation.

When he had at last finished his '*Littérature Anglaise*' Taine thought that he might grant himself a little holiday, and early in 1864 he went to Italy. He found it somewhat disappointing.

'The finest works of art do not touch me nearly as much as natural scenery,' he wrote from Rome. 'The decay of the frescoes of the greatest painters robs them of three quarters of their effect.' And again: 'I must confess that I have found things more beautiful in engravings than in reality.' ('*Vie*,' ii, 280, 284.)

A few months after his return from Italy Taine was appointed professor of æsthetics and of the history of art at the '*École des Beaux-Arts*.' His predecessor, Viollet-le-Duc, was supposed by the students to have been concerned in some very unpopular changes that had recently been introduced, and he had been compelled to resign owing to the showers of roast apples which fell about him when he attempted to deliver his lectures. In January 1865 Taine delivered his first lecture, and was warmly received—in quite another manner. After the lecture was over, the students, in spite of heavy rain, ran shouting after his cab until it finally stopped in the Rue Bretonvilliers, where Taine was then living. This friendly feeling was preserved all through the twenty years that he held the chair; and the lectures, which were condensed into the '*Philosophie de l'Art*,' were listened to with a respect that was almost reverential. M. Bourget has an admirable passage which shows us plainly what Taine symbolised to the rising generation of that day.

'I remember how, on the morrow of the war, we students, scarcely escaped from college, crowded, with beating hearts, in the great hall of the '*École des Beaux-Arts*,' where M. Taine lectured during the four winter months. . . . The Master spoke with a somewhat monotonous voice, which stamped the words of his little sentences with a vague foreign accent; even that very monotony, those rare gestures, that absorbed expression, that great anxiety not to add to the real eloquence of documents the fictitious eloquence of stage properties—all

those little details completed our conquest. This man, so modest that he never seemed to suspect his European reputation, and so simple that he seemed to care for nothing but the service of truth, became the apostle of our new faith. He, at least, had never sacrificed on the altar of official doctrines. He had never lied. It was really his thought that he offered us in those little phrases, which were at once so short and so full of meaning, his thought, profoundly, unconquerably sincere.' (*Essais de Psychologie Contemporaine*, p. 170.)

In 1867 he found himself sufficiently free and sufficiently strong to take up his great work, the '*De l'Intelligence*.' As he wrote to Sainte-Beuve, 'It is the root of all my historical and moral ideas.' It filled all his time for two years, although he had never quite ceased to think about it since his professoriate at Nevers and the preparation of his unsuccessful thesis on the sensations. It was published in 1869. He said, on its completion, 'The book will be read by a hundred people in France, and about as many in the rest of Europe.' His anticipation proved somewhat unfounded. The publication of the '*De l'Intelligence*' may be taken as marking the conclusion of the first period of Tainé's life. Until then he had endeavoured, with all the consistency that is given to man, 'to live outside time and space.' He had studied philosophy, literature, painting, and, above all, both through and apart from these media, man, his nature and his destiny; but from a point of view that was almost detached. As one of his early masters had said of him, 'His motto will be that of Spinoza, "Live to think." ... I believe his delicate, exceptional nature is ignorant of any passion except that of truth.' So far he had lent himself to real life only, as it were, in the guise of observer. Social life was to him little more than 'an aping of pleasure, a comedy of weariness.' He was armoured with pride. He writes of Lamartine's confidences, 'Thirty million companions are too many to my way of thinking.' He recommends his sister not to reveal her love of art, literature, or science. He shrank from the public eye. 'I desire, above all,' he wrote to his friend Planat about a proposed complimentary article in the '*Vie Parisienne*,' 'that my personality should escape the public.'

But complete detachment is impossible. We have seen

him brought into contact with political life; readers of his notes on Paris, on the provinces, on foreign countries, will remember what an undertone of sadness runs through them all. 'Perhaps all my impressions have a fault,' he writes somewhere; 'they are pessimistic.' And in his '*Voyage en Italie*' he writes again:—

'What a mass of ruins, what a graveyard, history is! . . . When a man has passed through half his career, and when, looking within, he counts the ambitions he has stifled, the hopes he has torn out, the corpses he carries buried in his heart, then the magnificence and the ruthlessness of nature appear to him together.'

To a man of acute sensibility the detachment of abstraction ultimately becomes intolerable.

'Ideas are abstract; you can only lift yourself to them with an effort. However lovely they may be they cannot suffice a man's heart.'

Taine was fortunate in that when he had just finished his inquest on human nature from an objective standpoint, when, after long meditation, he had definitely formulated his conception of man and of the universe that is presented to him, events drew him from his lonely abstraction—the cares and joys of married life, the responsibilities of fatherhood, and the troubles and convulsions of his country. He saw the need of a justification of his principles; if they were all he believed them to be, their application might save his countrymen from a repetition of the horrors of 1871, which had entered so deeply into his soul. The result was the '*Origines de la France Contemporaine*,' a work in which he sought the true principles of political action, as much for his countrymen as for himself. It was the fitting termination and application of the psychological theories which he had formed and tested in the last twenty years. Let us briefly, then, consider what were these theories of man and of the universe.

Taine's biographer, M. Giraud, has reproached him strangely enough with thinking at forty as he had thought at twenty. This is partly untrue. It would be very easy, with the material now before us, to trace the stages by which he came to value principles according to

their applicability to actual life, and to perceive that not mere truth, but useful truth, should be the object of philosophic search. But, if it be the case that Taine believed in the same general doctrines at forty as he did when he was twenty, it is difficult to see how that impairs the truth of his conclusions. If there is no possibility of reasonable certainty in these matters it does not matter whether a man changes his opinions or not; they are all equally valueless. If, on the other hand, the possibility exists, a man may find the truth at twenty as well as at forty, and, once having found it, he will not give it up. Taine was a pantheist and determinist at twenty: he remained such. Some form of monism was natural in the generation which saw the disappearance of immutable species, as to-day we are seeing the disappearance of what so many have looked on as irreducible elements. But the essential postulate of Taine's system was determinism. Free will, in the natural sense of the words, is inconsistent with any positive psychological theories. We must either resign any attempt at discovering the laws of mind, or we must accept Hobbes' old simile, 'As in the water, that hath not only liberty, but a necessity of descending by the channel; so likewise in the actions which men voluntarily do.' Pantheism is no more than opinion.

'When I watch the long ripple of the trees, the play of the light, the richness and abundance of all these forms and colours, when I listen to the low, uncertain, continuous, harmonious sound rising and falling in the trees, I *feel* the presence of the universal life.' ('Vie,' i, 29.)

But determinism is the starting-point of all organised psychological thought, an inevitable, if not always a conscious assumption.

'So far as I can see' (he wrote), 'the denial of the absolute determination of human volitions involves the destruction of moral science and of all power of prevision.' (Ib. ii, 353.)

But this monism and determinism were the limits of Taine's metaphysical postulates. He was no metaphysician; and his system was built, not on irresponsible intuitions, but on broad inductions. He would reduce metaphysics to a mere analysis of the partial sciences.

His true inspiration was science; his instruments, observation and analysis; his object, the human mind.

'True, free psychology' (he wrote) 'is a magnificent science, which has founded the philosophy of history, vivifies physiology, and is the key to metaphysics.' ('*Vie*,' I, 187.)] 'For forty years,' he said, at the close of his long life, 'I have worked at nothing but pure or applied psychology.'

Although he borrowed from Spinoza and Hegel the enveloping idea of pantheism, his philosophy itself was founded on psychological observation. Indeed the essential difference between the method of metaphysics and the method of science is that the former deduces the particular from the general, the latter infers the general from the particular. Hence the persuasive power of science, which enables us constantly to refer to experience as the test of truth. It was the establishment of this position which was the great contribution of the nineteenth century to human progress; but it had been prepared from afar. A long train of philosophers—in England, Bacon, Hobbes, and Locke; in France, Condillac and the sensational school—had asserted it against all true metaphysicians. Taine in some sort was their successor, in spite of fundamental differences; and there have been those who accused him of a materialism as crude as that of Cabanis. But to do so is surely as gross as to confuse Hobbes with Spinoza. Whatever else he was, Taine was an idealist in philosophy, though, strange to say, he found the germs of much of his thought in Condillac.

The latter, as we know, attached a great importance to words, even describing science as no more than a well-constructed language. Indeed his whole system seems based mainly on verbal distinctions. But he made one fortunate guess, which Taine analysed and developed. Our general ideas, he said, are really no more than signs, consisting of the images of words which are substituted for the sensations of general qualities which we cannot directly perceive. Analysing this position, Taine points out that a proper name stands for a group of images, a concept—in psychological terminology—which it tends to evoke. Very often, however, this group is not evoked. We can very well think of a proper name without being conscious of the group of characteristics which make up

the individual. In that case the image of the name becomes the equivalent or substitute for that group of images which correspond with the individual's characteristics. Still more is this the case with the names of a class of objects. We can have no single, definite image of them; their individual differences would inevitably blur the outline of the image. But the common part of a series of sensations is accurately and definitely represented by the image of the name which we give to the series. And still more again is this true of the names of general qualities. Of a general quality there is no possible image. But instead of this image we have the image of the name given to the quality, and that becomes its exact equivalent in thought. We cannot think, for example, of a pure number except through the name we give it.

He then passes on to consider the nature of the image in itself. Just as the abstract noun is a substitute for the abstract quality and enables us to think of it, so too the image, in its simplest form, is a repeated sensation, and a substitute for its corresponding sensation in thought. It would become a hallucination were it not counteracted by the actual sensation of the moment and other opposing influences such as are supplied by memory. We are thus brought to sensations, of which those of hearing and seeing certainly, and the rest probably, are composed of simpler elements which themselves are not present in consciousness. Here, it appears, is the central point of Taine's whole system.

In the sensation we first meet definitely with the dual aspect of life, moral and material. On the one side we have certain more or less definite nervous changes, which may ultimately be resolved into modes of motion; on the other, we have consciousness. These two are quite distinct and mutually irreducible. But nevertheless these two may be ultimately produced by a single cause, perceived through two mediums, just as we may apprehend an object diversely by two different senses. Taine therefore objects to Leibnitz's theory of prearranged harmony as involving an unnecessary hypothesis. There remain the materialist and idealist hypotheses. In the first place, he says, we know the moral side directly and the material side only indirectly; which should lead us to conclude that the material aspect is only a sign of the moral aspect.

This conclusion is rendered inevitable by the conclusion of his psychological analysis. As we have just seen, simple elements of consciousness are themselves extra-conscious. But, if they possess a moral value when taken together in consciousness, they must have a moral value when taken separately apart from consciousness. That is, phenomena lying beyond consciousness may possess an independent moral value. If we cannot deny this to some, it is clear that we cannot deny it to any. And he illustrates his meaning by a striking comparison of nature with a book containing an original text and an interlinear translation, whose successive chapters correspond with the various orders, passing from inorganic things to man. At the beginning of the book the translation is printed in clear, legible characters, but as we advance they become obscure; new characters appear which seem disparate from the simpler, earlier type; at last, especially in the final chapter, it becomes indecipherable, although a number of indications show that it is still the same language and the same book. This is the universe seen from its material side. With the original text it is just the reverse. Very legible is the last chapter, the ink fades as we go backwards; although you guess the words that have been there you cannot read them. At the beginning every trace has disappeared. Here we are compelled to infer the text from the translation, the existence of the moral from the existence of the physical aspect (*'De l'Intelligence,'* i, 334-5).

Such is Taine's theory of the universe. There is nothing new in idealism, but it was a novelty that it should be reached through physical research instead of through metaphysical speculation. And in considering his theory of man we find Taine's work to have been very similar. Starting from the position that 'every human state of mind is a product having causes and laws,' he sought the general qualities which lie within them, treating sentiments and ideas as one treats functions and organs, believing that 'the two orders of facts have the same nature, are submitted to equal necessities, and are but the obverse and reverse of the same individual, the universe' (*'Vie,'* ii, 183). The mind translates into its own terms phenomena of an apparently disparate nature. Taine analyses its ideas and finds that their content cor-

responds more and more precisely with exterior objects in proportion to the continued observation of man. Even in those cases where we evidently deceive ourselves—memories for instance, phantoms which *seem* past but *are* present—he concludes that 'Nature only deceives us in order to extend the limits of our mind, and that she only casts us into error in order to lead us to the truth' ('Vie,' i, 261), an idea of which much of the 'De l'Intelligence' is only a brilliant amplification.

Certain knowledge is therefore possible. But, if Taine is eager to indicate the power of human judgment, he is a destructive critic of the human personality.

'Beneath the phenomena which compose us' (he writes) 'have been placed two sorts of explanatory beings, first of all the powers or faculties which experience or produce them, and then the subject, substance, or soul, possessing them. These are metaphysical beings, pure phantoms engendered by words, which vanish as soon as the sense of the words is scrupulously examined.' ('De l'Intelligence,' i, p. 338.)

He analyses them; and the result of his analysis shows that 'power' or 'faculty,' applied to the mind, only means that, under certain circumstances, the will to do will be invariably followed by the action of doing; they only express a constant relation between two terms, the antecedent and the consequent. The ego, he says, has no powers or faculties, and in itself is only a continuous chain of phenomena; our personal identity is nothing more than the repetition of the same elements in the series of phenomena.

Here, too, there is nothing that we can call really new. It is in general the psychological theory founded by Hobbes and Locke, and developed by Hume, although Taine expanded and amplified it with new force and lucidity. Just as we saw in his theory of nature, so, too, in his theory of the mind he has employed, so far as possible, the method of physical research, but he has arrived at conclusions which others had reached by meditation and introspection.

But minds may be classified into general types, according to the series of ideas and the variety of emotion most commonly predominant in them. Some of these minds possess ideas of unusual energy and emotions of unusual

depth. These are the minds of great men, each of whom belongs to a particular type according to his predominant kind of idea and emotion.

'Analysis,' Tainé wrote to Sainte-Beuve about the latter's criticism of the '*Littérature Anglaise*,' 'is powerless to represent completely and in all its shades the absolutely special and personal, the infinitely multiplied and variable, imprint which constitutes the human character. But notice that this difficulty occurs everywhere, with an animal, a plant, a shell. Art itself, the most detailed painting, a portrait of (Clouet?), only gives an outline, a rough representation. No, analysis is not powerless if you only try to note the great characteristics which range the individual in his variety and species, to mark the generating and regulating forces of his action, and to indicate the degrees of these forces.' ('*Vie*,' ii, 309.)

The theory of the 'race, the environment, and the moment' was not intended to be more than an analysis of these forces. As he wrote in the letter already quoted, 'I have never intended to deduce the individual, or to show that a Shakespeare or a Swift should appear in such an age or in such a country.' Every individual is composed of general qualities of varying extent, qualities which he shares with all mankind, with all the men of his race, with all the men of his generation, with all the men of his class, and finally, qualities which he possesses with no one else. To the man enamoured of broad general views these latter are of the least interest; and those who attempt to judge Tainé's worth by the completeness and vividness of his evocations have failed to understand his point of view, and condemn him for the absence of qualities which he himself of set purpose had rejected. He nowhere aims at any illusion of life; he is scientific at heart, and artistic only by his style; he does not evoke but explain. His explanation may be mistaken; if so, he must be controverted by analyses more searching and arguments more cogent than his own. General views necessarily sacrifice detail; and all that can be required of them is not to violate detail. How can the historian of a nation's life pause to examine the development of a single individual? To say of him that 'he takes man at a given moment of his life; he does not trouble about the different epochs of his thought; he examines his work

in its totality, as if it had been produced whole on the same day; movement, development, life perhaps, escape him*—this is as fruitless as to judge the Elizabethan drama by the canons of Boileau. The race, the environment, and the moment do not explain why Pierre Corneille was a genius and his brother Thomas was not; what they do explain is, given the genius of Corneille, why it developed on certain general lines.

Let us look for a moment at the great example of Tainé's method, the '*Littérature Anglaise*.' Curiously enough, just after he had completed this work, an English critic was writing:—

'It is needless to dwell on the fact that the history of a nation's poetry has seldom been written with much reference to the national life from which it springs. It is the study of botany apart from geography.'†

At all events, this does not apply to Tainé, for the '*Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise*' is really a history of the English spirit. It is not so much a series of æsthetic appreciations as a series of solutions to problems in applied psychology. Given a writer, it is required to discover his dominant faculty and to show how far the three great forces, the race, the environment, and the moment, have influenced his work. And the problem which a literature offers is the same, except that here the dominant faculty and the race are identified.

What then is this predominant quality of our race? Fierce energy and obstinacy in labour, he answers, which, in union with the wild, fantastic, vehement imagination of a northern people, finds its true artistic expression in poetry fierce, sombre, and mysterious.

'Struggle,' he writes of the primitive Saxons, 'tenacious, painful struggle, inspired by exalted enthusiasm, is their favourite condition. Carlyle well said that in the sombre obstinacy of the English worker there still subsists the silent fury of the ancient Scandinavian warrior. To strive for the sake of striving is their delight. With what sadness, fury, and desolation such a nature overflows we shall see in Byron and Shakespeare; with what success and with what services

* M. Giraud, '*Essai sur Tainé*,' p. xxii.

† E. S. Dallas, '*The Gay Science*.' London, 1893.

it restrains and employs itself we shall see in the Puritan.' ('Engl. Lit.,' i, 27.)

On the whole this is true ; it does not, perhaps, contain all the truth, but at least the essential truth. The sentiment Taine describes does run through all our national life and cause the greater part of our national actions. The system which formulates thus may well be forgiven if it neglects the accidental and the ephemeral.

The illustration of this sentiment is the purpose of his book, and an exaggeration of this sentiment its fault. Sometimes he seems to strain facts somewhat in order to bring it out the more clearly—in his account, for instance, of the excesses of the Elizabethan drama, or of the moral purpose of the eighteenth-century novel. But after all it is only the exaggeration of one a little too much inclined to see the general in the particular, and besides, probably unavoidable in a man of acute sensibility, to whom all things seem greater than to other men, and a foreigner, to whom things appear under an aspect of strangeness that is unknown to ourselves.

As a critic he is interested in the conditions which limit the production of a work rather than in the work itself. Such conditions act in a twofold manner, first, through heredity, to form the dominant faculty of the writer ; secondly, through environment, to determine the manner in which it shall be exercised. The same general causes which have gone to mould a man have gone also to fashion his contemporaries ; and, where all the forces concur to the same end, where the particular accidents of birth and education act in the same direction as the general tendencies of the time, to develop a talent which is completely capable of expressing the sentiments of the age, the result is art in which the age itself is reflected with incomparable precision. We cannot doubt that this is generally true ; the danger lies in endeavouring to apply it too narrowly. The tendencies of one age are always prolonged into the next, and there meet with the embryonic sentiments of succeeding periods ; so that in each we find, not only the dominant sentiments of the present, but also the waning sentiments of the past and the waxing sentiments of the future. Sometimes all these meet in the same individual. Spenser looks back

to scholastic, medieval thought; he reflects the half pagan sensuousness of the Renaissance; he anticipates something of the Puritan revolution. Here we meet with the great difficulty of all moral science. We must isolate before we can analyse; and isolation is artificial.

But nevertheless we can trace a close and constant relation between an author's work and his environment. He can only praise or blame, idealise or execrate the things he knows. His writings form the satire or the eulogium of the sentiments among which he lives, just so far as he himself is in or out of harmony with them. Let us take one last illustration from the '*Littérature Anglaise*'—Tennyson and his audience. Taine shows us the latter, living mostly in the country, their houses surrounded by pleasant trees and gardens. Where there is an ancient building it has been preserved, and with it the new has been harmonised. Without and within all is calculated to increase the material well-being of the inhabitants. Their minds are balanced; their faith and laws are good, useful, moral, broad enough to give shelter and employment to every sincere mind.

'Such is this elegant, sensible world' (he goes on), 'refined in point of well-being, self-restrained in point of conduct, which is shut by its dilettante tastes and moral principles in a garden full of flowers, out of which it cannot look. Could there be a poet more suitable than Tennyson for such a world? He is moral without being pedantic; . . . he has never revolted against society or life; he speaks of God and the soul nobly, tenderly, without ecclesiastical prejudice. . . . You close the book with no troubled feelings; putting it down, you can listen with no sense of incongruity to the grave voice of the master of the house reading family prayers.' ('*Engl. Lit.*,' v, 459-461.)

Here again we find the same omission of detail which would disturb the harmony of the whole; but, in the main, is it not true of mid-Victorian society, and of Tennyson—true, at least, as far as it goes?

These are the essential features of Taine's work as a psychological critic of literature and painting. He had not sought with Sainte-Beuve the determination of the precise shades of individual genius; but he had attempted to trace the broad lines of development of the human

spirit, and to analyse those forces which control and modify its development. He had found his formulas; he had tested them in the study of literature and art; he had gauged their applicability by foreign travel and the conversation of men. And now the time had come for him to use these formulas in more serious matters than the science of æsthetics. He was to spend the rest of his life in attempting to trace in detail the manner in which his fellow-countrymen had reached their hazardous position, and to indicate the manner in which it seemed to him that they might escape from it. But that is matter for the second part of his life, his work as a moralist, for an estimate of which the materials are still wanting.

We know with how bitter an antagonism a certain class of mind has assailed his teaching, not only in literature and art, but still more in politics. It is possible that the impersonal, scientific treatment of moral subjects may be replaced and deemed as valueless as the system of scholastic philosophy which it has banished. For with tragic vehemence man after man, generation after generation, has struggled with the facts of nature, straining fine intellects to devise some theory elastic enough to contain them, not only as they are known, but as posterity is to know them. Theory after theory disappears; and, if our theories stand higher than our ancestors', it is because they rise upon a pile of ruins. To-day Tainé's conclusions seem less sufficient, less convincing, less consolatory than they did to his own generation; but nevertheless the even beauty of his life remains, and will remain. 'To pursue an end which you approach slowly, therein lies health; the rest is nothing but disease.' This saying of his young courageous manhood is the most fitting life-motto of one who, from the beginning to the end of his career, pursued his object with labour which was never checked, except by ill-health—an object untouched by low ambition or paltry desire; an impossible ideal, it may be; but what can better show the nobility of the human mind, the pathos of human fate, than such unceasing effort to understand, and to frame our actions in accordance with our knowledge?

H. HERBERT DODWELL.

Art. IV.—THE CARE OF THE INSANE.

1. *Report of the Select Committee on Lunacy Law, 1877.*
2. *Annual Reports of the Lunacy Commission, 1894-1904.*
3. *Chapters in the History of the Insane in the British Isles.* By D. Hack Tuke, M.D. London: Paul, 1882.
4. *The Insane and the Law.* By G. Pitt Lewis, Q.C., R. Percy Smith, M.D., and J. A. Hawke. London: Sweet and Maxwell, 1895.
5. *Lunatic Asylums.* 'Quarterly Review,' No. 202. London: Murray, 1857.
6. *The Journal of Mental Science.* Vols 86, etc.

IN England and Wales the care of the insane belongs to the sovereign. Such it was ordained to be, nearly six centuries ago, and such it is to-day. It is as the special deputy of the King that the Lord Chancellor is at the head of the Board of Lunacy. When he receives from the monarch the Great Seal, the general charge of the insane is committed to him by a separate and special process which has to be witnessed by a secretary of state. It is a charge distinct from that of the control of 'Chancery lunatics,' which devolves on him *ex officio* as the head of the Court of Chancery. It is as the direct representative of the King that the Lord Chancellor is the custodian of all other idiots and insane persons. The fact deserves special emphasis, because it is the explanation of what has seemed to many so anomalous—that a lawyer is at the head of the body which has the care of so vast a province of disease.

The right of the Crown to have custody of the lands of the insane is first legally stated in the famous document called 'Prerogativa Regis,' which is supposed, though without full warrant, to have been passed as a statute in the year 1324. The custody of their lands almost necessarily involved the charge of their persons, as is plain from the provisions of the 'Prerogativa'; and the charge of their persons followed, in fact, much the same lines as the rules governing the succession of minors, women, and aliens. The profit which the Crown drew from such a charge may be regarded as a sort of exalted perquisite. The apparent anomaly to which we have

referred becomes less when we examine the words of the 'Prerogativa,' and perceive all they signify. They run, in English, as follows:—

'The King shall have the custody of the lands of natural fools, taking the profits of them without waste or destruction, and shall find their necessities of whose fee soever the lands be holden; and after the death of such idiots he shall render it to the right heirs, so that such idiots shall not aliene nor their heirs shall be disinherited.

'Also the King shall provide, when any that beforetime hath had his wit and memory happen to fail of his wit, as there are many with lucid intervals, that their lands and tenements shall be safely kept without waste and destruction, and that they and their household shall live and be maintained competently with the profits of the same, and the residue, besides their sustentation, shall be kept to their use, to be delivered unto them when they come to right mind; so that such lands and tenements shall in no wise be aliened; and the King shall take nothing to his own use. And if the party die in such estate, then the residue shall be distributed for his soul by the advice of the Ordinary.'

The King thus took the superfluous income of idiots, but not that of those with acquired insanity.

The 'Prerogativa' is a document which, whether enacted as a statute or not, probably stated what, at the time of its composition, was regarded, at least by the Crown lawyers, as being within the competence of the Crown, either by law or ancient custom. Some of the statements which it contains are based on previous statutes, e.g. that touching the King's right to wreckage. Others, including those touching idiots and lunatics, do not appear to have any such statutory basis. There is, however, indirect evidence that the right in question existed in earlier days. The records contain clear proof of the King's charge of idiots, of which, strange to say, no notice has been taken by any writer on the subject, legal or other. The estates of these 'idiots' or 'fatuous' are stated to be in the King's hands; and he commits them to some custodian, with the stipulation that he shall provide the owner with the due necessities of life, and shall pay to the King annually a certain specified sum. The entries are for several years, before and after the

date of the 'Prerogativa,' the earliest belonging to 1300.* All these entries in the Rolls series relate to idiots. This agrees with the distinction made in the 'Prerogativa,' by which the King could appropriate the income of the idiot but not that of the subject of acquired insanity. It is the more significant because in the Pleas of the reign of Edward I there are entries relating only to the invalidity of deeds, but they refer to those executed by persons *non compos mentis* as well as by the idiot and 'fatuous.'

The charge of the insane continued to be in the hands of the Crown, but was delegated to the Lord Chancellor, as the King's representative, possibly from the first. It is said that in the reign of Henry VIII the 'Court of Wards' took over his duties in this respect. Be that as it may, the charge was resumed by the Lord Chancellor when that court was abolished by statute (12 Car. II, c. 24); and in his hands, as representing the sovereign, the charge still remains.

The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries afford us little other trace of any actual care of the insane. They were then regarded as subjects to be treated rather than tended. The treatment was in part by medicinal agents, by certain so-called 'simples,' but chiefly by measures intended to be curative, and determined by the theory of 'possession' by evil spirits. The fury of the maniac seemed to need mechanical restraint; and the supposed cause of his fury, a somewhat vague idea of demoniacal possession, made it seem reasonable that, if he had to be bound, it should be to sacred pillars in churches, of which some were held in special esteem for the purpose. For less severe cases of derangement, recourse was had to sacred wells, with the same object. The occasional quietude produced by long restraint and exhaustion would be referred to the sacred influence. A like combination of motives may have determined the flogging and whippings which were inflicted on the unhappy sufferers to get rid of the evil spirits that possessed

* Abb. Rot. Originalium, 28 Ed. I, i, 112. The treatise called 'Fleta,' probably composed about 1290, tells us (I, xi, § 10) that, the 'tutores' of older days having abused their charge, it was enacted that the King should have the charge of 'idiota et stulti.'

them. Physical suffering has often been, in the past, a means of self-improvement; and, when evil tendencies were personified, it is not surprising if the same system was adopted as a means of treatment. We may conceive that, occasionally, an apparent confirmation of its utility confirmed the belief. The influence of pain and exhaustion combined may arrest an attack of maniacal *furor*, or hasten the end of one that has nearly run its course. As always happens, the few apparent successes eclipse the common failures; and the exception is held to prove the rule. This may well have established a belief in the efficacy of such measures, on what seemed then to be reasonable ground. The fear inspired by furious, and even by quiet, mental derangement has a very solid foundation; and the obvious safety involved in chain and shackle must have been a powerful motive in the adoption of such restraint, and may have strengthened the faith in it. So much should be recognised in explanation of the tortures inflicted, which descended to an age when less excuse can be found. For any real care of the insane, such as we now consider to be their paramount need, we may search during this period in vain.

But private effort has ever anticipated public duty. Through the Middle Ages active beneficence, all the wide range of good-doing which we now associate with the word 'charity,' was confined to one channel. Abundant as it was, it was the work of the various bodies of men who are included under the term 'religious orders.' The gulf seems deep between those who adopted the life of recluses with the object of saving their souls, and those who gave themselves up to the assistance in the present life of persons needing help 'in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity.' How much good the religious wrought in their daily life we can neither discern nor compute, but vast it must have been. It is not therefore surprising to find that it was a 'religious house' which made the first attempt to promote systematic care for those deranged in mind. Such sufferers were probably cared for, among others, in many establishments of the kind; but for long years one alone made this its main object—that which added to the English language the word 'Bedlam.'

The Priory of St Mary of Bethlehem, or of the 'Star

of Bethlehem,' was founded in 1247 by Simon Fitzmary for quite a different object, in order that the Bishop of Bethlehem in Palestine should have a home of his own to which to come when he visited England. It was made subject to the Bishop of Bethlehem; but not one bishop availed himself of the founder's hospitable designs. The Priory was alien, and, as such, it was seized by the Crown in 1375. How it came to pass that the Priory became the first home for the insane is uncertain; but in 1403, some years after its seizure by the Crown, this use was definitely established. An inventory of that date records that there were in it six pairs of chains, four manacles of iron, and two pairs of stocks—the means of treating, according to the current method, perhaps a dozen inmates. A story is related by Stow—who wrote, it is true, nearly two centuries later—that a religious house near the present St Martin's Lane was a still earlier receptacle for the insane. It was near the royal mews in which—on the present site of the National Gallery—the King's falcons were kept. The vague words of Stow's statement (which is often cited as a definite assertion) are worth quoting. Speaking of a lane leading up to the Church of St Martin's-in-the-Fields, he says:—

'Then had ye one house, wherein were sometime distraught and lunatic people. Of what antiquity founded, or by whom, I have not read, neither of the suppression; but it was said that sometime a King of England, not liking such a kind of people to remain so near his palace, caused them to be removed further off to Bethlem, without Bishop's Gate of London, and then to that Hospital. The said house by Charing Cross doth still remain.'

In whatever way the Priory first received its insane inmates, henceforth it seems to have been devoted to their care. A hundred years later we find Bethlehem had become Bethlem and even Bedlam, in popular language. A 'Bedlamite' was synonymous with an insane person; and 'Bedlam' beggars were discharged patients who sought alms near the Priory gate. This evidence of the notice that the work attracted is remarkable, considering that, even towards the end of the sixteenth century, there was provision for only twenty-four inmates. The state of these is said to have been loath-

some. According to Stow, payment was exacted from at least some of them, although Sir Thomas Gresham, in 1575, left a bequest towards their support. During the seventeenth century the demand upon it increased; and, about 1650, fifty patients were received. Its income was augmented, not only by the payment for the inmates, but by their utilisation as a public show, a charge being made for the sight of the manacled and chained inmates on their straw. Pepys and Evelyn record visits. More noteworthy is the fact that, in the middle of the seventeenth century, a doctor was appointed governor—the first trace of the recognition of insanity as a disease.

The increasing demand on the accommodation of the hospital led to its removal to a new site in 1675, where Finsbury Circus now stands; and provision was made for 150 inmates. These were probably well paid for; and the evidence it afforded of the demand for such provision may have been the reason for the establishment of many private asylums towards the end of this century, with multifold abuses. It was not until 1713 that the example of Bethlem was followed by the foundation, by a generous lady, of Bethel Hospital, Norwich, for the lunatics of the city and county.

Private homes, which we may ascribe largely to the influence of Bethlem, had become numerous by the beginning of the eighteenth century. In some instances quack remedies were advertised by those who kept the establishments—nostrums to be taken by the mouth or rubbed on the head. The ease with which persons could be seized and conveyed to such places with a mere semblance of legal formality aroused widespread indignation, which Defoe expressed in his 'Journal,' but to little purpose. No attempt to afford more legal control can be discerned throughout the century. Private effort was not wanting. In 1751 St Luke's Hospital was established by voluntary subscription in the middle of the City; there it remains, though not on the original site. It is strange indeed that the asylum should be retained in a position, now destitute of any advantage, with almost every conceivable drawback, when the sale of the site would enable double or treble the amount of good to be effected outside London. The present building in Old Street was erected in 1780; and its gloomy aspect, familiar to many,

may be explained by the fact that its architect had designed Newgate prison.

These institutions were solely for those who could pay or be paid for. For the poor insane, nothing was done. They were consigned to the cellars or garrets of workhouses, or to prisons, when room could be found; and the less troublesome were boarded out. Those who were violent were, as of old, chained to tables or the wall, with straw to throw themselves on; and, if they tore up their clothes, they were left naked, however great the cold. No facts exist to show the results of the treatment; but, from evidence of concealment of mortality, it is probable that the death of at least one third of the unhappy patients was directly due to their management. Nor was the treatment different in St Luke's or Bethlem. The truly iron hand of custom pressed heavily on the sufferers. Manacles for restraint, and 'lowering measures,' such as starvation, coupled with the occasional infliction of physical pain, were the means of treatment universally accepted. It is strange that no idea of change seems to have come from the medical profession. We may almost wonder whether they were yet emancipated from the idea that insanity was a 'possession.'

The dawn of a brighter day came at last from that perennial source of beneficence, the Society of Friends. John Howard, in his Report on Prisons (1774), compared the treatment of the insane in England with that in Constantinople, to the disadvantage of the former. The Turk had not then, perhaps, become 'unutterable'; and his management of the insane was far more humane, and seemed to yield better results. We cannot doubt that Howard's words were known to another member of the same society, Samuel Tuke. An asylum at York, established by voluntary contributions, carried out, like all others, in full measure the common treatment. One of the patients was a Quaker; and his friends were denied access to him. Enough became known of his treatment to arouse warm indignation. Tuke was apparently actuated by the conviction that 'example is better than precept,' and he set to work to establish a better plan. With the help of others, he founded the 'York Retreat,' an asylum in which mechanical restraint was limited to absolute necessity, in which good food replaced semi-

starvation, and efforts were made to improve the mental state of the inmates by wisely devised occupation. The institution was opened in 1796. The results of the revolution in treatment, of the release of the victims from the chains which held them helpless while the malady preyed upon them, as the eagle on Prometheus, were soon manifest. The success that was achieved quickly became known to all who were concerned with the insane. Visitors came from far, even from the Continent, to inspect the 'Retreat.' Tuke was a cautious man, and established his facts before he published them, so that it was not till 1813 that he issued a full account of the 'Retreat.' His endeavours to make widely known the effects of a reversal of the customary treatment received help from a powerful source. Sydney Smith reviewed Tuke's book in a short but effective article in the 'Edinburgh Review,'* which must have spread widely the knowledge of what had been achieved. Medical journalism as yet was not; but Sydney Smith was doubtless able to speak from personal knowledge, since he had been living near York while his rectory at Foston was being built, and he refers to Tuke in terms which imply at least acquaintance.

But Tuke's institution, like the private homes mentioned above, was for those who could pay. The state of the pauper insane remained unchanged. An attempt made to ascertain their number failed; in one county it was afterwards shown that the numbers were four times that which was stated. In 1808 an Act was passed permitting the justices of the peace to provide asylums for the insane poor, which was as ineffective as permissive legislation generally is. But in 1815 a commission was appointed to ascertain the facts regarding the actual treatment of the insane. The report of the Commissioners was such as should have shocked the whole nation; but, a century ago, it was not easy to disseminate such information in effective form. Sydney Smith's sympathies with the cause of reform had been thoroughly aroused; and an article on the report, which appeared in

* April 1814, p. 190. As this article is not included in any published list of Sydney Smith's contributions, it may be well to say that it was attributed to him in a later article in the same Review (vol. 131, p. 424).

the 'Edinburgh Review' for 1817, must be placed among his strongest efforts for the public good.* Only the strongest sense of the compulsion of duty can have led him to include in his article extracts from the evidence obtained, which were so loathsome that it is questionable whether any review would have published them to-day. One of the least offensive passages which he quotes from the report may be given. 'One of the side-rooms in Bethlem contained ten female patients, each chained by one arm or one leg to the wall, allowing them only to stand or sit down on a bench, each covered only by a blanket gown, with nothing to fasten it in front.' Even in Bethlem and elsewhere, ingenious tortures were contrived by the keepers to subdue those who were refractory. The abuses were defended by the superintendents, who, though incompetent and sometimes drunken, were annually praised in the manager's reports.

The publication of the report of 1815 led to some amelioration of the conditions to which the insane were subjected; but Bill after Bill to establish better control and supervision failed to pass through Parliament. Party controversies absorbed the legislators; and 'further enquiry' was a facile lever to push aside a social measure of reform, however urgent. But the harmfulness of chains, and the vast good achieved by freedom and gentleness, gradually became recognised. It was found better for a raving maniac, in the last resort, to throw himself against padded walls than to tear his flesh against restraining fetters. But it was not till about 1830 that even a general knowledge of these facts penetrated the minds of those who had charge of the insane; and it was chiefly owing to the efforts and example of Dr Connolly that the principle gained full recognition.

The worst forms of restraint ceased about the middle of the last century; and the manacles and chains, once deemed essential, were soon banished to museums of curiosities. Some restraint is still recognised as occasionally indispensable, but it is seldom applied for more than a day; and the 'strait-waistcoat' suffices for all needs.

* This article has never been acknowledged as by Sydney Smith, but has been attributed to him by Dr Hack Tuke; and there is conclusive internal evidence that it was by the same writer as the first.

This garment, with sleeves so much longer than the arms that they can be tied to the bedstead, is the only measure of restraint now adopted. It is probable that, at the present day, the mechanical restraint of the strait-waistcoat is less used than is advisable. Every occasion of its employment has to be reported to the Commissioners and entered in their report; and frequent recourse to it is regarded as discreditable. The manual restraint by attendants is therefore substituted whenever possible—a measure far less humane and attended with far greater risk of injury to the patient.

While public opinion was thus gradually changing, no legislative step was taken until 1827, when Mr R. Gordon brought before the House of Commons the anomalous position of the College of Physicians. In 1774 they received authority to appoint commissioners from their body to inspect asylums; but no power existed by which they could rectify what they found wrong, and so gradually inspection had ceased. The disgraceful state of the pauper lunatics of London was also brought forward by Mr Gordon. As a result of his efforts, a parliamentary committee was appointed in 1827 to report on the state of the pauper lunatics of the metropolis, who were found in a shocking state. The result was a Bill to take from the College of Physicians the task which they could not perform, and to vest it in fifteen commissioners; a number which was reduced in 1832 to two barristers and four or five physicians. But nothing was done for the country at large until 1842, when the metropolitan Commissioners, increased in number, were made a committee to investigate the state of the insane in the country generally. They presented their report in 1844; and it revealed a state of things such as to startle the most callous. The pauper insane numbered 16,821, for only one quarter of whom any provision had been made in county asylums. Of these some were wholly unfit, while twenty-one counties in England and Wales had none at all. A large number of insane were in work-houses, and many boarded in private asylums. In Wales the state of the 1177 insane was most distressing, even worse than in England. More than a thousand were living with their relatives, a condition which gener-

ally entails, among the poor, more cruelty than any other. In the whole of England and Wales the known insane numbered 21,788.

The report of 1844 was the real turning-point in the care of the insane. In 1845 Lord Ashley made a powerful appeal to the Government to act upon it. But Sir James Graham, who may have represented the Lord Chancellor on this subject in the Lower House, refused immediate action. The result was that Lord Ashley, whose feelings of compassion and sense of right were too strong to brook official hindrance, himself introduced two Bills of profound importance, which the Government, for very shame, could not oppose. In little more than two months both became law. They are termed by Dr Hack Tuke 'the Magna Charta of the Insane.' They made the provision of county asylums compulsory instead of permissive, and provided for proper certification, for the keeping of records of the state of every patient, and for the due visitation of all cases, including those in workhouses. They also established for the first time a permanent Lunacy Commission, consisting of three legal and three medical Commissioners, to visit all cases and supervise all arrangements and proceedings. Minor additions to the Acts were made in 1852, especially extending the regulations to single patients, and including Bethlem Hospital in the visitation. Rumours of ill-treatment in asylums led to a committee in 1859, which recommended some reform, especially regarding the large number of lunatics (7632) detained in workhouses without proper treatment. Some of their suggestions were carried into effect in 1862; and increased duties were thrown on the Commissioners.

In 1877, in consequence of rumours in connexion with private asylums, a committee was appointed, on the motion of Mr Dillwyn, which held an elaborate enquiry, not only into the charges (which were found to be groundless), but also into all the details of the care and supervision of the insane. Their report led to no legislation, but is of the highest value on account of the information on almost every point supplied by the answers to the questions. Public attention was afterwards drawn to the subject by the allegations of a few persons who conceived they had been wrongfully confined. These chiefly took

the form of actions at law against the doctors who signed the certificates, who were involved in heavy expenses, although the actions failed. Whatever is proclaimed in a voice sufficiently loud and penetrating always obtains some credence. An important Act was passed in 1890, consolidating the previous measures, providing more apparent safety for patients by ordering that all cases should be approved by a justice of the peace, and a safeguard for the doctors by precluding any action if their certificates were signed *bona fide*.

It is needless to describe in detail the arrangements made in 1845; in essential character they obtain to-day. That some alterations are likely to be required is obvious when we remember that sixty years of modern life cannot pass without altering much, alike in facts, in their relations, and in the capacity to discern them. During the last sixty years the population of England and Wales has doubled; but the number of the insane under care has increased more than fivefold. It does not, indeed, follow that there has been this increase in the number of the insane. The slow perception by friends of the advantage of asylum care, and of the domestic relief thus obtained, together with the enforcement of the law, accounts for some increase in the number cared for. But the increase goes on. In 1845 there were only about 23,000 under care. In 1877 there were about 65,000. The last report of the Commissioners gives the number for January 1, 1904, as 117,199—3235 in excess of the number a year before. The average yearly increase has been 1.5 in excess of the growth of the population. We may safely assume that the number at the beginning of 1905 was not less than 120,000.

The insane are divided into two classes—those who possess money, and those who do not. When the insanity of those with means has become confirmed, their property is placed under the management of the Court of Chancery. The impecunious are supervised by the ordinary Commissioners; the wealthy are supervised only by the Lord Chancellor's 'Visitors in Lunacy,' whose duty is solely to visit them at stated intervals. The proceedings of both these bodies, the Visitors and the Commissioners, are shrouded from direct observation; but much may be

learned indirectly from the evidence given before the 1877 committee, and also from the Lunacy Act of 1890, which prescribes their duties. Moreover, the work of the Commissioners is fully set forth in their annual reports. These are the chief sources from which the following account is drawn.

We may consider, first, the supervision of the ordinary insane by the Commissioners in Lunacy. Besides the work of visitation, one medical Commissioner must be in attendance daily at the chief office in London. He has to consider carefully the evidence of insanity stated on every certificate sent in, and to judge whether it is adequate. He has to consider every report on the cause of death of a patient in order to ascertain that there is no ground for suspecting ill-usage. He has to consider and deal with all special reports. The annual number of new cases is about 22,000; and, although most of these are paupers, the number of documents to be dealt with daily is very large. The death reports are fewer, less than 9000 a year, perhaps an average of twenty-five a day, according to the last annual report. But many special reports come in regarding detention, change of residence, recovery and release, any of which may contain facts of which only the medical commissioner can judge.

In their visitation work the Commissioners have to visit the patients in (1) county and borough asylums; (2) in 'hospitals' (really asylums for the insane, supported partly by a charitable foundation and by subscriptions, partly by payment by the inmates); (3) in licensed houses, i.e. private asylums; (4) in workhouses; (5) those in single care, chiefly in the homes of doctors. The number of lunatics under care has, as we have just seen, quintupled since 1845; while, apart from this enormous numerical increase, modern demands in respect of sanitation, and many other conditions that influence the welfare of the patients, have vastly added to the labours of the Commissioners. Yet their number remains unchanged. They were not deemed too many for 23,000 patients in 1845; they are now compelled to endeavour to deal with nearly 100,000 more. Probably no more astounding fact could be found in the annals of the public service; indeed a stronger epithet would not be misplaced. It was stated before the committee in 1877 that an increase in the num-

ber of the Commissioners was then urgently required, not only on account of the larger number of the patients, but on account of the altered character of the work. The need was, indeed, forcibly recognised by the committee, who, in their report, expressed the opinion that 'it seems physically impossible that, with the present strength of the Lunacy Commissioners, minute supervision of those who require it can be efficiently exercised.' But this expression of opinion had no effect on the Lord Chancellor, nor has it had any on his successors.

The need for an increase in the number of Commissioners has been repeatedly urged since that time, although by voices unlikely to reach the ears of the Lord Chancellor. It was insisted on by Dr H. Rayner in 1884, and by Dr Murray Lindsay in 1893, both physicians of the highest standing and experience in this branch of medicine; and the protest was made, in each case, in a presidential address given before the Medico-Psychological Association, a society which devotes itself to facts and problems connected with insanity. At last the Commissioners have been compelled themselves to urge their need for help. We learn from the last report that, two years ago, they brought privately before the Lord Chancellor the impossibility of the proper performance of their duties without an increase in their number. This also, strange to say, had no effect. It seems to have elicited only a statement that the measure was 'inconvenient.' Last year the Commissioners felt compelled to take a bolder step. Their published Report says:—

'It became necessary in the course of the year 1903 to apply for an increase in the number of Commissioners. Although attention has been drawn on previous occasions to the additional labours necessarily devolving on the Commissioners by the large yearly increase in the number of patients and of institutions for the insane, no definite application had hitherto been made on their behalf; but the present conditions under which we work render it absolutely necessary, with a view to the continued efficiency of the Commission, that such increase should forthwith be made. We accordingly applied to your Lordship, and sent a statement, which was afterwards, with your Lordship's sanction, forwarded to the Treasury, setting out in some detail the grounds of our application. It has not hitherto been convenient, as we under-

stand, to bring the subject before the attention of the legislature. The necessity for such addition, however, still exists in an increasingly urgent form. Three thousand two hundred patients and five asylums were added to the list in 1903, and there is no reason to doubt, from our experience of the six months prior to the presentation of this Report, that the same relative increase will be maintained in the year 1904. The efficient and satisfactory administration of the Lunacy Acts, under which great benefits accrue both to the patients and to the country at large, cannot longer be continued on the existing arrangements, which, generously sufficient for the duties of the Commission in 1845, are quite incompatible with those of 1904.'

That this appeal should be necessary is more than surprising. It shows that there is a grave defect in the whole system. That the number of Commissioners must be increased is quite clear. But in what form is the increase to be made? This raises the question of the constitution of the Commission, a question which merits consideration, especially as it involves more than one practical problem. We have seen that the paid Commissioners in Lunacy are six in number, three medical and three legal, each with a stipend of 1500*l.* a year. With them are associated three unpaid Commissioners, not medical, one of whom acts as chairman. Their function is apparently to attend general meetings, and to give such advice as their inclination disposes and their capacity enables them to give. The three legal members must be 'practising' barristers of five years' standing. There is also a legal secretary, who must be a barrister of seven years' standing, but need not be 'practising.' It has been the custom to appoint the secretary to any vacancy among the legal Commissioners; and for this his familiarity with the work necessarily fits him.

Two of the medical Commissioners are taken from the superintendents of public asylums, one from among general physicians. No one can be appointed who has had any interest in a 'licensed house,' i.e. a private asylum, for a year before. It is, moreover, a prudent arrangement that one of the medical Commissioners should come from the ranks of general medicine, free from asylum traditions. A recent conspicuous example of its success was afforded by one whose efficient tenure of the post, short as it was, won him high esteem among

those whom he had to supervise—the present Regius Professor of Medicine at Cambridge.

We have already made some observations on the Commissioners' duties in general. Much of their time is occupied by the examination of patients in single care needing special attention. The large number of patients in many asylums compels their inspection in bulk; but to each patient is given the opportunity for private conversation with the Commissioner, if it is desired. At the chief office they have also to perform the duties we have already mentioned. The subjects they have to consider are chiefly medical; and it is necessary for one of the three medical Commissioners to be always in attendance in London. The visitation is also essentially medical; it follows that each medical Commissioner has to perform his out-duties, the supervision of 35,000 or 40,000 cases, in eight months; and from a third to a quarter of their time must be taken up in travelling. One witness before the 1877 committee avowed that only three patients in single care can be seen in a day, so far apart are they as a rule. Moreover, if the Commissioners are human (though they are scarcely dealt with as such) they need holidays, which must reduce the period available for inspection to six and a half months.

One question is likely to present itself to every thoughtful reader. Why are there as many barristers as doctors on the Commission? Insanity is a disease; and most of the work of the Commissioners is, if not purely medical, such as needs, or may need at every turn, knowledge which only the medical Commissioners possess. Moreover, all the unpaid commissioners are non-medical; so that the lay element preponderates in the proportion of two to one. It is not easy to see why this should be the case. The question how it came to be so admits, however, of an answer. The fact is due to three causes. In the first place, there is a small but absolute need for legal aid, because the law safeguards those who must be under medical care. The second reason is partly historical, and curiously illustrative of English ways. Throughout the Middle Ages lunacy was regarded, as we have seen, not as a disease, but as a demoniacal possession. Long after that time the fact that insanity is a disease was still generally unrecognised; and it seems to have been so even when, in 1845, the Lunacy Act was passed. No

other conclusion can be drawn from the proposal made by Lord Somerset in 1842, that the Commission should consist only of barristers. Even Lord Ashley, who, with all his benevolence, suffered from some narrowness of mind, maintained in the House of Commons, in 1844, that, in a case of insanity, any man of common-sense could give as good an opinion as a medical man, 'when it had been established that the patient's insanity did not result from the state of his bodily health.'

These examples show that the old idea was still alive that insanity could exist independently of a morbid state of the brain. The notion of mind as independent of the organ through which it is manifested was really the old notion expressed in terms a little, but not much, more modern; and it was strengthened by the prevalence of certain forms of religious belief. It is strange that the consequence of this belief in the existence of mental derangement without cerebral disease was not realised by those who held it. The mind was associated with the soul as surviving death; but its independence of the brain involved the persistence of its own derangement after death, an idea from which they would certainly have shrunk had the consequence of their belief been frankly presented to them. These views were of course opposed by those who regarded insanity as a disease; but so strong was the old belief that a compromise was the result. Accordingly, two doctors and two barristers were appointed in 1844 to make enquiries; and in the next year three doctors and three barristers were invested with the supreme care of the insane.

But there is still a third reason, the influence of which it is not easy to assess. The opinion of Lord Ashley, that any man of common-sense would do as well as a doctor, does not explain why barristers were solely selected. The legal work could be easily done by one barrister or solicitor. But the circumstance that the representative of the Crown is a lawyer himself may help to explain the special choice of members of his profession to carry out the details of the work delegated to him. The fact that in both departments, alike at the central board and in local visitation, the work of the medical Commissioner is essential, makes it certain that, whenever Parliament is asked (as it must be) to increase the

number of Commissioners, the question of the value of the legal members will come up for decision. The service they actually render is not obvious, but a little may be discerned. The legal points which occur in the course of their visitation cannot be very numerous; and the decision of them must generally take place at the office in London. A legal member can inspect the general and recreative arrangements while his medical colleague is inspecting the patients. The legal members sometimes visit single patients alone. They perhaps write the reports. This is as much as can be discerned. The subject was vigorously discussed by Sir John Tuke in the House of Commons last spring (May 1904); and the fact that he adds a thorough knowledge of the English system to long practical experience as the head of an asylum in Scotland, renders his opinion worth careful consideration. He said:—

‘The medical and legal Commissioners hunt in couples, the legal Commissioner knowing no more of medicine or of lunacy than Policeman X. The idea was that some point of law might arise in the course of the visit which could only be settled by the legal Commissioner. He challenged the Commissioners to adduce a single case within the last forty years in which such an emergency had arisen. Any irregularity could be detected by the medical Commissioners and reported and considered in the Board room. The legal Commissioner wrote the Report, and, in fact, performed the duties of a clerk.’ (Hansard, 1904, p. 1157.)

Beyond the inspection of general arrangements and the listening to imaginary legal grievances, it is not easy to expand Sir John Tuke’s summary of their services. But it is absolutely impossible, with the present staff, that all small licensed houses and all patients in single care should be visited every time by a medical Commissioner; some of these must, perforce, be visited only by the legal colleague. He is, after all, a Commissioner, however unable to discern medical points; and his solitary visit to single patients is not forbidden by law.* It is

* The Lunacy Bill introduced into the House of Commons (‘for appearance’ sake) in May 1904 contained a clause to legalise the visitation of small asylums by a single Commissioner, evidently in order to increase the scope of the legal members. The provision is of more than doubtful wisdom.

not at all surprising to find it stated that the visit of a legal Commissioner is often distinctly preferred to that of a medical Commissioner. The fact is quite intelligible. However well a legal Commissioner does his duty, it is quite impossible for him adequately to replace a medical Commissioner in the examination of a patient or the inspection of arrangements. Symptoms which would seem quite trivial to the one may have definite and perhaps important significance to the other. The most that the legal Commissioner can do to lessen the labour of his medical colleague without harmful substitution cannot amount to much.

It seems certain, then, that the increase in the Commission should be in the number of the medical Commissioners only. Any increase in the number of the legal Commissioners would be a waste of the taxpayer's money, from which the cost must come, unless different arrangements (presently to be discussed) are made. The addition of three medical members to the Commission would reduce the number of the cases that each has to supervise, from about 40,000 to about 20,000, still nearly three times as many as in 1845.

The arrangements in Scotland in this respect merit consideration and comparison with our own. Scotland has been free to make her own rules and regulations, untrammelled by the ideas and customs of the past. Two years ago there were less than 16,000 insane persons in Scotland. They were under the supervision of two medical Commissioners and two assistant medical Commissioners. The latter are rendered necessary by the extensive use of the system of 'boarding out' patients, which entails a large amount of private inspection. If we disregard the assistant Commissioners, each medical Commissioner has to supervise 8000 insane; if we include them, the number is much less. In Scotland legal help has been obtained by the appointment of consulting legal Commissioners. No working Commissioner has ever been a lawyer. On any legal point the assistance of the consultative Commissioners has been readily obtained; and this arrangement appears to have been completely adequate, and to have worked with perfect smoothness. If the Scotch find they can do quite well without any visiting legal Commissioners, the necessity

in England of having an equal number of legal and medical officials surely needs reconsideration.

To the second class of the insane—those possessed of means—we have, so far, only briefly referred; but the arrangements for them have a close relation to those touching pauper lunatics. The law places the property of all permanently insane persons possessed of wealth under the Court of Chancery. These, however, are again subdivided into two classes. If they have more than 50*l.* a year, their personal custody passes to the Court; and they are charged a percentage for the management of their property. If it is less, their affairs are managed for nothing; but the care of their persons rests with the Lunacy Commissioners. The mental condition of those who become 'Chancery lunatics' is the subject of 'inquisition' by one of the 'Masters in Lunacy,' of whom there are two, each with a stipend of 2000*l.* a year, who also control the estates. The personal supervision of these Chancery patients, i.e. those possessing over 50*l.* a year, is entrusted to the 'Lord Chancellor's Visitors in Lunacy,' one legal and two medical, each of whom receives the same salary as a Commissioner, 1500*l.* a year. The number of patients whom they have to visit was stated before the 1877 committee to be rather more than 1000. At the present time the number, as enquiry at the office ascertains, is 718. Each patient has to be seen by one of the Visitors four times annually during the first two years and twice a year afterwards—a superfluous frequency, considering that almost all are confirmed cases. Thus each medical Visitor has about 360 persons to visit, while each medical Commissioner has the supervision of more than 39,000. It is at least remarkable that, while there are as many legal as medical Commissioners, it is only considered necessary to have one legal Visitor to the two medical. With so much legal talent at headquarters, is there any need for the legal Visitor at all?

When the 1877 committee took evidence, one third of the Chancery patients (say 240) were in single care and two thirds in private asylums. There is no reason to believe that the proportion is different now. This gives eighty single patients to each Visitor. We learn from the same source that three single patients can be seen in a day,

on an average, by one Commissioner; and a Visitor should have equal energy. Of the whole number of Chancery patients, two thirds, or about 480, are in 'licensed houses,' i.e. 'private asylums.' All these institutions have to be visited also by the Commissioners, for the sake of the other inmates. The inspection of these by the Visitor, when there, should be quite practicable, and would considerably lessen the work of the Commissioners. It is not surprising that the question of the amalgamation of the two departments, as regards visitation, should have been raised by the committee of 1877. Opposite opinions were expressed; but, if these are weighed impartially, the conclusion is irresistible that the reasons in favour of amalgamation are of far greater weight than those against it, and that, in the latter, feeling has a larger place than fact. We cannot now consider them, but may note that this seems to have been the impression made on the committee. The opinions in their report have far more force to-day than at the time they were uttered, since, for 'more than a thousand' Chancery patients, we should now read 718, and for 65,000 other lunatics we must substitute 120,000. The Report says:—

'Either the Chancery lunatics, who number less than a thousand, have too much care bestowed on them, or the others, who exceed 65,000, have far too little. The property might still remain under the care of the Masters, in whatever way may be considered best, but it seems reasonable that all lunatics should be treated on the same system as far as admission, detention, supervision, and release are concerned. And, although it may be true that the lunacy of the majority of patients in an asylum is self-evident, yet it seems physically impossible that, with the present strength of the Lunacy Commissioners, minute supervision of those who require it can be efficiently exercised. It may be that, by some amalgamation of the two departments, waste of power in visiting might be obviated.'

There can be no doubt that the work of the Chancery Visitors is as easy as that of the Commissioners is hard—so hard indeed for the medical members as to form an impossible task. Even such amalgamation as would enable the Chancery Visitors to supervise all the patients in the private asylums at which Chancery patients are

confined, would, as we have said, save a great amount of useless double work and travelling.

These recommendations of the committee regarding the offices, definite though they were, have remained a 'dead letter' so far as practical result is concerned. But one remarkable effect may reasonably be ascribed to them. The Lunacy Act of 1890 has given power to the Lord Chancellor to amalgamate the two departments when and how he chooses. By § 337 the Lord Chancellor may, if it seems expedient to him so to do,

'by order under his hand, amalgamate the office of the Masters and their staff, and the office of the Chancery Visitors and their staff, or either of them, with the office of the Commissioners, and may give such directions as he thinks fit for the exercise and performance of their duties,' etc.

He is also empowered, with the concurrence of the Treasury, to fix the qualifications and salaries of the members of the amalgamated office, but not to the prejudice of the then holders of the posts. He is also empowered to pay such proportion of the cost as he may determine out of the percentage paid by the Chancery lunatics for the care of their property.

These powers are indeed of sufficient amplitude, but apparently, during the fifteen years which have elapsed, it has not 'seemed expedient' to the Lord Chancellor to exercise them. Can it have been with this object that the clause was inserted in the Act? The final provision for the payment of the expenses (which are to include the erection of offices) out of the percentages received from the Chancery patients, suggests that these must be considerable in amount. We find from the last revenue returns* that the percentages were estimated, for the year 1904-5, at 18,000*l.*; and to this should be added the sum received for stamps in connexion with legal proceedings, which is not less than 9000*l.*† Thus the Treasury receives from this department 27,000*l.*, a sum which exceeds its cost (16,757*l.*) by 10,000*l.* The expenses of the Lunacy Commission amount to 15,259*l.*, to which, however, should be added 3845*l.*, of which the huge sum of 2260*l.* is for office accommodation, furniture, etc., and

* Estimates Civil Service, Law and Justice, p. 243.

† *Ib.* p. 230.

1130*l.* for 'non-effectives'—pensions, we presume. Against this the only receipts are the sums paid for licenses for private asylums, which amount to 1112*l.* The salaries of the Visitors amount to 4500*l.* a year, those of the Commissioners to 9000*l.*; but, omitting travelling expenses, the cost of visitation of each of the 718 Chancery cases works out at about 6*l.* 10*s.* a year; that of each patient under the Commissioners at 2*s.* 6*d.*

The vested interests of officials always constitute a grave hindrance to any departmental reform. This was clearly anticipated in the Act of 1890, which provided that none of those holding office at that time should be prejudiced. An immediate improvement of conditions could therefore not be effected without an increase of expense; but, if the powers given had been used, the cost might by this time have been reduced to its earlier dimensions. An addition to the number of medical Commissioners is imperative. Two more might suffice for a short time, but not for long, if the present rate of increase in the number of the insane continues. They would, however, be enough if the two departments were amalgamated. On the other hand, as we have seen, three legal Commissioners are more than enough. If the offices were amalgamated, and if the posts of the legal Visitor and of one legal Commissioner were discontinued at the next vacancies, the two additional medical Commissioners would involve no increased charge on the taxpayer.

One other effect of the Act of 1890 should be noticed. It precluded the granting of any fresh licenses for private asylums, apparently under the idea that profit induced undue detention. It is doubtful, however, whether the latter is possible under the present careful observation of the Commissioners; at least it would not be possible were their number adequate for their work. But another intention was probably to encourage the choice of the semi-public 'hospitals,' and even the paying departments of public asylums. This result has been distinctly achieved. The clear independence of profit in the hospitals has had a considerable influence on the preference of the public; and the number of patients in purely private asylums has steadily lessened. It might be thought that this provision would have increased the pecuniary value of 'licensed houses' of this class, as it has been

thought that a similar enactment would enhance the value of 'licensed houses' of a very different nature. At present it has not had this effect, although it may hereafter. There is, in certain sections of the community, an inextinguishable demand for the seclusion and privacy of such asylums; even the upper classes often prefer them to single care, because thereby more specially experienced medical attention is secured.

Another reform is needed, with yet more obtrusive urgency, in the interests of the sufferers themselves. Of this there is some prospect. A large number of the insane, especially of those who are comparatively young, pass through a stage in which there is hope of recovery. Besides these, there is a still larger number of patients who are verging towards insanity but are not yet over the line. On the mental unsoundness of some of these, two doctors might differ in opinion. Such cases need the care of those who have had experience in 'personal conduct' on the road to health; and for this it is generally needful that those who take care of them should not be relations or familiar friends. But if such patients can be certified to be of unsound mind—and, if they are not, they may easily become so by a trifling intensification of the morbid state—they cannot legally be received by any person for payment without being stigmatised as insane by certification and placed under the control of the Commissioners in Lunacy. This sometimes induces definite unsoundness, or takes away the chance of recovery. It is harmful to the patient and painful to the friends. The need for milder measures in such cases had been brought before the Lord Chancellor by the Medico-Psychological and British Medical Association; and it was the chief subject of an address to the former society by Sir William Gowers in 1902.* What is needed is the adoption of a system similar to that which exists in Scotland, by which a person with incipient insanity, if fraught with no danger to himself or others, can be received for treatment for six months on a simple medical certificate that there is a prospect of recovery.

It may seem strange that the arrangements in Scotland

* 'Lancet,' November 22, 1902.

should be so far in advance of those in England as to furnish a model to be followed. We have already mentioned the Scottish system of Commissioners; and the whole history of the care of the insane north of the Tweed is of great interest. Only the briefest sketch can be given here. The earliest traces to be obtained reveal the doctrine of the *pater patriæ*, but with apparent disinterestedness. Idiots were consigned to the nearest male relative, the 'furious' to the charge of the King, as alone having the power of consigning them to control. The first attempt at systematic care was made in 1792; but the attempt 'hung fire' until, in 1806, the legislature appropriated certain moneys to two somewhat incongruous objects, the promotion of the fishing industry and the care of the insane. Meanwhile the 'York Retreat' was making its remarkable influence felt; and an asylum was finally opened in Edinburgh in 1813. Subsequent measures to improve the state of the insane in Scotland came slowly. The local opposition to the erection of district lunatic asylums was everywhere strong and for a long time effective; and the improvement in the state of the insane during the first half of the last century was even less than in England. But if slow in its approach, it was better for the delay. The experience of England was especially useful. No connexion exists between the two systems; but the lessons taught in various ways in England were not disregarded across the Border; and present arrangements in Scotland are such as to excite the envy of those in England who have the real interests of the insane at heart. Yet it must be remembered that the conditions differ considerably in the two countries. The arrangements made in Scotland were the more effectual because it was early realised that lunacy is a physical disease, and the Scotch were free from the regal and legal bonds which had such influence in England.

The fact should be realised that in England there are many cases of early and slight insanity in which the law must be broken, not to save pain to the friends, but, on the highest medical advice, to save the patient's mind from becoming permanently deranged. This course necessarily involves some risk. If such a patient is distinctly 'over the line,' and can be technically said to be of unsound mind, the person who receives payment for

him, even if a relative, is liable to prosecution, and to a penalty if conviction follows. It is so even with nursing-homes; it is so in cases of organic brain disease, such as may also paralyse the patient; it is so also with cases of defective mind. Space precludes the quotation of examples of such prosecution; but some, of surprising character, will be found in the reports of the Commissioners for the last ten years, and were quoted by Sir William Gowers. A relative can keep any case uncertified, if no payment is made; and it is among such that the examples of cruelty have occurred which have occasionally shocked the public. It is of course essential that all cases should be under conditions that are salutary and likely to promote recovery. But this would be equally secured by a system of notification to the Commissioners, with the power of visitation if deemed necessary, and the ability to order removal if this appears desirable. At present the power of inspection can only be secured by the process of certification; and since this is, in many cases, needless and harmful, it is inevitable that the law should often be violated. It is not well that a law which must be broken should remain unmodified, or that so great a difference should exist between the law of Scotland and that of England; and it is most important that the needed relief should be given.

A Bill to effect this modification was introduced into the House of Lords in 1900 and 1901; but the Government did not give facilities to enable it to pass the House of Commons, into which a similar Bill was introduced, *pro forma*, in May 1904. Such a measure should not be longer delayed. It is indeed strongly recommended by the Commissioners themselves in their Report for 1903. They suggest also an important modification of one of the clauses (§ 7), which enacts that 'no person shall under this section receive more than one patient at the same time.' Literally interpreted, this would preclude the reception of another patient, of whatever nature, and would harmfully restrict the utility of the measure. The Commissioners suggest also a modification of clause 8, which enacts that,

'after the expiration of the period mentioned in the certificate, another certificate under this section in respect of the

same patient shall not be given within two years from the date of the expiration.'

It is worth while to give the actual words of their comment, because the Commissioners know better than any other persons the amount of possible danger that may be connected with the arrangement. This is the more important, since the question of public safety may be made a convenient and plausible means of restricting the operation of the measure by those to whose interest it seems opposed. The Commissioners say:—

'We think that clause 7 might be modified by permitting more than one patient to be received with our consent; that clause 8 might be varied by the substitution of six months for two years; and that permission might also be given for the reception of voluntary boarders into single care, just as they are at present received, upon their own application, into hospitals and licensed houses. This would enable persons who are capable of exercising volition and are desirous of subjecting themselves to treatment, being suitable for residence under such conditions, to avail themselves, without difficulty or more than nominal formalities, of medical or other care in its simpler and less restrictive form, and in private houses as well as in institutions.

'We have, however, no doubt that, both in the course which was embodied in the Bill, and in that which we have above indicated, there should be immediate notification to us, with power to visit whenever it should appear to us to be desirable, and to vary or determine the residence under the conditions of these new enactments, whenever we considered it necessary.'

A suggestion was made by Sir William Church, in a letter to the 'Times,' that such cases might be notified to the Medical Officer of Health, who should report to the Commissioners if all was not right; and a similar suggestion was made by the late Dr Mortimer Granville in his evidence before the 1877 committee. It would probably be practicable and effective, and may be necessary, unless the Commissioners are adequately increased in number. It would be well, indeed, if such a provision were made applicable to all cases of disease of any kind received for payment; and the homes in which they are received should always be inspected by the Medical Officer of Health. But for this, wise as it would be, we must wait.

It has indeed been said that any such provision for the relief of early, threatened, or feared insanity is rendered needless by the present law, which allows such sufferers to go into asylums as voluntary patients. Those who hold this opinion know little of such cases. To suggest to a patient, whose great terror, generally speaking, is lest he should become or be thought to be insane, that he should become an inmate of a lunatic asylum, is a procedure that has only to be stated to be condemned. Nor could it survive a recital of the experience of some of those who have adopted this course. We have seen an account of the experience of one who went as a voluntary patient to a 'hospital' of high repute, a large semi-public institution. The constant companionship of the insane, the shrieks and sounds from far and near, were so unendurable that he obtained leave to try to secure quiet in the carpenter's workshop, where he found the occupation to be that of making coffins for the inmates. The constant locking and unlocking of every door involved unceasing suggestions, while his insomnia was not lessened by the light of a lantern being thrown on his face each hour through the night. After three weeks he felt that, if he remained, he should become definitely insane. He left, and under private care speedily recovered.

The arrangements for the care of the insane need improvement in other ways, of which there is little present prospect. Every medical superintendent of an asylum is also its general manager; and this work, involving a vast amount of writing, keeping accounts, and the like, largely diminishes the time that he is able to give to the patients. There is much truth in the statement made by Mr Brudenell Carter in a recent book:—*

'The medical superintendent has to be the head of a great establishment, embracing gardens and a farm, as well as the staff and buildings of the asylum itself. The managing committee value him for the sake of the qualities they can appreciate. He must, primarily, be a firm and strict but just master, an administrator and organiser, and only secondarily a skilled physician. . . . Men enter asylum medical service at the outset of their career, and grow up under its conditions.

* 'Doctors and their Work,' by R. Brudenell Carter, F.R.C.S. Smith, Elder & Co., 1903.

Each enters the groove early in life; and, to ensure promotion, the groove must have been of such a character as strongly to divert his attention from medicine and direct it towards administration.

It would be well if the two branches of work were separated, so that the most experienced medical officer could give his undivided attention to his patients.

In truth, through the whole system runs the dominant idea that the insane need only care, and should be left to get well if they can. An entire separation of their medical supervision from general medicine is the inevitable result. Yet medical science shows more and more the interdependence of morbid states, and the unwisdom of all narrow exclusiveness. A few asylum medical officers are indeed doing good work at the pathology of insanity; and the London County Council, some years ago, wisely appointed to their asylum at Claybury a skilled pathologist, whose researches have been of great value to pathological science. The same Council, in 1889, considered a plan for a definite bridge between general medicine and the care of the insane. A committee, presided over by Mr Brudenell Carter, took much evidence, which is printed in their report, and recommended to the County Council that a small hospital for the insane should be built near London, with a staff of two resident medical officers having asylum experience, and four physicians, each of whom should be physician to a general hospital. But the Council rejected the proposal. Whatever the result, it would certainly have been an interesting experiment.

Many of the facts we have surveyed tend to bring us back to the place from which we started. The insane are, one and all, the subjects of disease, of disorder of the higher functions of the brain, induced by various morbid influences and morbid tendencies. That is a proposition from which few would now venture to dissent. The sufferers, as we have seen, are in the ultimate custody of the Lord Chancellor as the representative of the King. Is it not time that this fact were fairly faced? Reverently as the seventh Edward may regard the action of the first, times have changed as centuries have passed; and that which was inaugurated as a source of regal income

has no longer such motive. The arrangement is of no advantage to the Crown, but has many disadvantages to its subjects. The Lord Chancellor, as the King's representative, is subject to the control of Parliament only when a change in legal arrangements is proposed, or when an alteration in the payment to his subordinates involves an increased demand on the Treasury. Public opinion he can ignore with impunity; and he can disregard as he likes even the representations of his subordinates. The insane constitute only one of a multitude of matters to which he must attend, and they can receive only a rare fraction of attention.

Some day, near or remote, we doubt not it will be deemed wise to break this chain, forged long ago by the Plantagenets, and to free the insane from the legal dominance which has already become, in the main, a hindrance rather than a help. When that day comes, it may be that all the work of the departments which deal with public health, and with this form of disease, will be united under a responsible minister. The management of inebriates, now under the Home Office, the general hygiene of the country, with the investigation and arrest of epidemics, and the supervising control of the Medical Officers of Health, now under the Local Government Board, might well be joined to the supervision of the insane. All these have closer mutual relations than any one of them has with the department with which it is now connected. Combined, they would furnish an adequate basis for a separate department and a special minister. Many improvements in asylum work would then be possible, at which we have been unable to glance. The time for such a rearrangement is not yet, but may be less distant than it appears.

Art. V.—THE COLLECTED WORKS OF LORD BYRON.

1. *The Works of Lord Byron: Letters and Journals.* Edited by Rowland E. Prothero. Six vols. London: Murray, 1898-1901.
2. *The Works of Lord Byron: the Poetical Works.* Edited by Ernest Hartley Coleridge. Seven vols. London: Murray, 1898-1904.

THE completion of what may be regarded as a final edition of Byron's writings both in poetry and prose is surely a notable event in literary history. Nothing indeed is likely to modify very materially either the estimate which has been formed of his character since the appearance of Moore's work, or the verdict which his countrymen have long since passed on him as a poet. But we are now in a position to understand much in the man himself, and more in his work as an artist, which it was not possible to understand fully and clearly before; we are enabled to review both, if not in any absolutely new light, at least in the light of testimony and illustration so ample, nay, so exhaustive, that probably nothing of any importance will ever be added to it. In these thirteen volumes we have a contribution to biography and criticism to which it would be difficult to find a parallel in modern times. There is no corner, no recess, in Byron's crowded life, from boyhood to manhood, from manhood to the end, into which we are not admitted; we know him as we know Pepys and as we know Johnson.

To say nothing of a correspondence in which his experiences and his impressions, his idiosyncrasies and his temper, are reflected as in a mirror, records intended for no eyes but his own reveal to us his most secret thoughts. He is exhibited in all his moods and in all his extremes. We can watch every phase which, in its rapid and capricious alternations of darkness and light, his extraordinarily complex and mobile character assumed. The infirmities, the follies, the vices which revolted Wordsworth and Browning and degraded him at times to the level of fribbles like Nash and Brummell and of mere libertines like Queensberry and Hertford; the sudden transitions by which, in the resilience of his nobler

instincts and sympathies, he became glorified into the actual embodiment of what at such moments he expressed in poetry; the virtues on which those who admired and those who loved him delighted to dwell, and which could transform him momentarily into the most heroic, the most generous, the most attaching of men; the strange anomalies for which the perpetual conflict between his higher and baser nature, and between his reason and his passions, was responsible; his mingled charlatanry and sincerity, refinement and grossness, levity and enthusiasm; the magnanimity and dignity which could occasionally be discerned in him; the almost incredible paltriness and meanness of which at times he was capable; his sanity, his good sense, his keen insight into men and life, his admirable literary judgments, so singularly and glaringly contrasted with the childishness, the obliquity, the extravagance which he displayed when under the influence of prejudice or passion—all this makes his autobiography, in other words, his correspondence, memoranda, and journals, a psychological study of no ordinary interest.

Nor is this all. His poetry is so essentially the expression of his character, and was so directly inspired by his personal experiences, that these records form the best of all commentaries on it. His letters will probably live as long as his poems. Voluminous as they are, they never bore us. Social sketches dashed off with inimitable happiness; anecdote and incident related as only a consummate *raconteur* can relate them; piquant comments on the latest scandal or the latest book; the gossip and tittle-tattle of the green-room and the boudoir, of the clubs and the salons, so transformed by the humour and wit of their cynical retailer that they almost rival the dialogue of Congreve or of Sheridan; shrewd and penetrating observations on life, on human nature, on politics, on literature, dropped so carelessly that it is only on reflection that we see their wisdom, keep us perpetually amused and entertained.

Of the conscientiousness and skill with which Mr R. E. Prothero has performed a most difficult task we cannot speak too highly. In the first place, he has spared no pains to make the correspondence as complete as possible; with what success, a comparison of the number of letters which have appeared in preceding collections with the number

printed by him will at once show. If he has, to some extent, fared as those who glean after the full harvest must necessarily fare, he has not only preserved much which was worth preservation, but he has been able to add substantially to what was of most interest and value in preceding collections. And here we must say a word in commendation of the assiduity with which the second and the third John Murray for eighty years devoted their resources to the collection of the materials without which this edition would have been impossible of achievement. They and their house owe much to Byron, but they have not spared themselves in their endeavour to repay their debt; and lovers of literature are under no small obligation to them.

Mr Prothero has not only given us an exhaustive edition of the letters, journals, and memoranda, and settled what must henceforth be their standard text, but he has done much more. No man entered more fully into the social and literary life of his time, or took a keener interest in the incidents of the passing hour, than Byron. The consequence is that the letters and journals teem with allusions and references to individuals and to current topics, as well as to the literature of the day, which the lapse of nearly a century has made unintelligible without continual elucidation. This Mr Prothero has given us, and given us in a measure pressed down and overflowing. We have memoirs and notices of all the persons, many of them long since forgotten, to whom the letters are addressed, or of whom they make mention; and rare indeed it is to find anything requiring explanation which is left in obscurity. His notes are in themselves delightful reading, and we are not at all inclined to quarrel with their occasional diffuseness.

But important as this edition is as concentrating all that throws light on Byron as a man, it is still more important from the light which it throws on his work. If, in editing the correspondence, journals, and miscellaneous prose writings, Mr Prothero had a difficult task imposed on him, a still more difficult task was imposed on his coadjutor, the editor of the poems and dramas. When we say that Mr Coleridge's edition contains, not only every complete poem and drama written by Byron, but every fragment of the smallest interest which can

be gleaned from authentic sources; that his text has been formed by collation with the early printed copies and with the original manuscripts where they are extant, as in most cases they are, every variant and erasure being carefully noted; that every poem is furnished with elucidatory notes explaining allusions and citing parallel passages to which Byron was, or may have been, indebted; that to each of the chief poems and collection of poems is prefixed a more or less elaborate bibliographical, critical, and generally illustrative introduction—some estimate may be formed of the immense labour expended on his work.

A poet more troublesome to a conscientious editor than Byron could hardly be found, and this for three reasons—the multiplicity of the sources of his text, the large space which topics of ephemeral interest fill in his poetry, and the difficulty of identifying or even of explaining the innumerable reminiscences and references which his loose and desultory but immense reading supplied in such profusion. A very superficial acquaintance with Byron's writings will enable any one to understand what the adequate annotation of such poems as the 'Hints from Horace,' 'The Vision of Judgment,' 'The Devil's Drive,' 'The Blues,' to say nothing of 'English Bards and Scotch Reviewers,' and, above all, 'The Age of Bronze' and 'Don Juan,' must imply. No doubt the labour was somewhat lightened, as Mr Coleridge acknowledges, by that great work, which has lightened so much editorial labour, the 'Dictionary of National Biography'; but all that the Dictionary could afford represents only a fraction of what was necessary for the elucidation of these poems. Mr Coleridge has brought to his task an extensive knowledge of general literature, and a still more extensive knowledge of the literature immediately preceding and contemporary with Byron. Memoirs, correspondence, 'ana,' novels, travels, periodicals, newspapers, and all such publications as are known to have been in Byron's hands, have been explored by him; and with the happiest result. For he has thus been enabled, not only to explain the innumerable references and allusions in the poems which the lapse of time has, for the present generation, rendered obscure or even unintelligible, but in conjunction with the notes on the text, to furnish

with the best of commentaries on Byron's methods and technique. The chief infirmity of the notes lies in the parallel passages. Mr Coleridge, in our opinion very rightly, attaches importance to them as illustrating a striking characteristic of Byron—the union of originality with an indebtedness to his predecessors and contemporaries so considerable as to be not a little surprising, particularly in a poet of his temper. But many of the most remarkable of these reminiscences are not noticed by Mr Coleridge, though a place is found for many which might easily be resolved into mere coincidences. To this, however, we shall return presently.

We pass to the contents of these seven substantial volumes, which represent all that has been given, or probably ever will be given, to the world in verse from Byron's pen. The first question which every reader will naturally ask is: do they add anything of importance to what we already have, any poem which deserves permanence, or which strikes a new note? This may be answered, with some little reserve perhaps, in the negative. Of the thirty poems published here for the first time, the insertion of at least two thirds could only be justified by the consideration that it was desirable to make the collection complete. The eleven early poems printed from the Newstead manuscripts are much below the level of the verses comprised in the 'Hours of Idleness'; the lines beginning 'I cannot talk of love to thee,' 'Julian,' 'The Duel,' the 'Ode to a Lady,' in volumes iii and iv, have no distinction; few of those printed in volume vii are, so far as intrinsic merit goes, worth preserving. Every one will turn with interest to the seven stanzas, with the prose note containing the savage attack on Brougham, which were to follow stanza clxxxix in the first canto of 'Don Juan,' and to the fourteen stanzas opening the seventeenth canto of 'Don Juan' found in Byron's room at Missolonghi. But no one can read them without feeling how little, even as a satirist, his reputation gains by the first series, and how painfully, in their flaccid diffuseness, the second series illustrates his decadence. Nor is the fragment of the third part of 'The Deformed Transformed' likely to gratify anything but curiosity. The most remarkable of

these pieces is the fragment of a poem on Aristomenes, dated Cephalonia, September 10, 1823, in which he certainly struck a new note, and, what is not a little surprising, a note closely recalling Keats.

But it is as affording more copious material than has hitherto been collected for a critical estimate of Byron's work as a poet that this edition is perhaps of most interest and importance. We are now enabled, thanks to Mr Coleridge, to distinguish between what Byron owed to nature and what he owed to predecessors and contemporaries, and, following him into his workshop, to study his methods and to be admitted into all the secrets of his technique. It will certainly come as a surprise to many to learn how often the most vehement and impetuous of poets, in what appears to be the full tide of impassioned inspiration, is, at the same time, the most patient of artists; how, with so much originality in essence, his poetry is, in expression and often in imagery and sentiment, almost as much indebted to assimilative memory as that of Gray or Tennyson.

Among Byron's many affectations was his hypersensitive anxiety to have it supposed that composition cost him no labour; and of this he was always boasting. 'Like Edie Ochiltree,' he said, 'I never dowed to bide a hard turn o' wark in my life.' That he composed, as a rule, with great rapidity seems certain, but that he took immense pains in preparing himself for composition, and in revising what he composed, is abundantly apparent, not only from the elaborate accuracy of his realism, when realism was his aim, but from the testimony afforded by the variants and deletions in his manuscripts and proofs. Of the first, we have two very striking illustrations in 'Don Juan,' namely, the shipwreck and the incidents succeeding it in the second canto, and the siege of Ismail in the seventh and eighth. Of the shipwreck, he himself said there was 'not a single circumstance of it not taken from fact; not indeed from any single shipwreck, but all from actual facts of different wrecks.' The fidelity with which this part of the poem was compiled, in other words, constructed out of passages dovetailed from Dalzell's 'Shipwrecks and Disasters at Sea' (1812), Hartford's 'Remarkable Shipwrecks,' Bligh's 'Narrative of the Mutiny of the "Bounty,"' and his own grandfather's narrative, shows

to what patient and scrupulous drudgery Byron could sometimes submit. Most of the passages borrowed by him have been duly recorded in Mr Coleridge's notes, but one of the most interesting and remarkable appears to have escaped his notice. The magnificent stanza—

'And first one universal shriek there rush'd,
Louder than the loud ocean, like a crash
Of echoing thunder; and then all was hush'd,
Save the wild wind and the remorseless dash
Of billows; but at intervals there gush'd,
Accompanied with a convulsive splash,
A solitary shriek, the bubbling cry
Of some strong swimmer in his agony'

—was plainly based on the following passage in the wreck of the 'Pandora' ('Shipwrecks and Disasters,' vol. iii, p. 129):—

'Within a very few minutes of the time when Mr Rogers gained the rock an universal shriek, which long vibrated in their ears, . . . announced a dreadful catastrophe. In a few minutes all was hushed except the roaring of the winds and the dashing of the waves. . . . The cries of men drowning were dreadful in the extreme, but died away by degrees as they became faint.'

It would indeed be quite impossible to exceed the scrupulous particularity with which, even to the most trifling minutiae, Byron has drawn on these narratives, owing literally nothing to invention. In his account of the siege and capture of Ismail he has drawn in the same way, and almost to the same extent, on the Marquis Gabriel de Castelnau's 'Essai sur l'Histoire ancienne et moderne de la Nouvelle Russie.' And this drudging industry was not more remarkable than the labour expended on successive editions of some of his poems, notably 'English Bards and Scotch Reviewers,' the 'Hints from Horace,' and 'The Giaour.'

What labour composition sometimes cost him will be plain to any one who will turn to the record of the variants in stanza ix of the first canto of 'Childe Harold,' and in cxxxiv of the fourth canto. How revision could at times transform his poetry is illustrated by the passage

which every one knows in 'The Giaour,' 'He who hath bent him o'er the dead.' The lines which now run:—

'The first dark day of nothingness,
The last of danger and distress,
(Before Decay's effacing fingers
Have swept the lines where beauty lingers,)
And mark'd the mild angelic air,
The rapture of repose that's there;
The fix'd yet tender traits that streak
The languor of the placid cheek';

originally ran:—

'The first dark day of nothingness,
The last of doom and of distress,
Before Corruption's cankering fingers
Hath tinged the hue where beauty lingers,
And marked the soft and settled air
That dwells with all but spirit there.'

The line 'Where cold obstruction's apathy,' which occurs later, illustrates what is often perceptible in Byron's variants. A reminiscence of Shakespeare's 'cold obstruction' occurring to him as he corrected the proofs, suggested it; just as, in the apostrophe to the ocean in 'Childe Harold,' the memory of a couplet in Campbell's 'Battle of the Baltic' enabled him to transform—

'These oaken citadels which made and make
Their clay creator the vain title take,'

into

'The oak leviathans, whose huge ribs make,' etc.

There is a variant in the description of the thunder-storm in the third canto of 'Childe Harold' which, poor as it is, is certainly preferable to the ludicrous line for which it is substituted:—

'The glee
Of the loud hills shakes with its mountain-mirth,
As if they did rejoice o'er a young earthquake's birth';

namely,

'As they had found an heir and feasted o'er his birth.'

There is one characteristic of Byron's variants which is very significant: they rarely improve the rhythm, and

were apparently seldom designed for that purpose. So incurably bad was his ear that occasionally they are, from this point of view, alterations for the worse, as here ('Childe Harold,' III, lix):—

**'Wild but not rude, awful yet not austere,
Is to the mellow earth as autumn to the year.'**

In the MS. this was softened by reading—

'Rustic, not rude, sublime, yet not austere.'

So in the 'Siege of Corinth,' the lumbering line,

'The vaults beneath the mosaic stone.'

ran in the MS.,

'The vaults beneath the ^{chequered} ^{inlaid} stone,'

where, had 'chequered' been chosen, the rhythm would have been faultless.

But the combination of a capacity for drudging industry with a genius and temper which seem scarcely compatible with the practice of so humble a virtue, is not the only anomaly in Byron's constitution. In three respects he bears a remarkable resemblance to a class of poets with whom he would at first sight appear to have nothing in common. Neither Virgil nor Horace in ancient times, not Milton or Gray nor even Tennyson in modern times, has been more indebted to preceding and contemporary literature. An extraordinarily wide range of reading, a memory remarkable alike for its tenacity and its ready mastery over its acquisitions, and a not less remarkable power of assimilating and of reproducing in other forms what was thus acquired, are quite as characteristic of Byron as of the poets to whom we have referred. It may sound paradoxical to say that Byron owed more to reading and books than he owed to independent observation of nature and life; that what in his poetry was directly inspired by his own experiences and impressions bears a very small proportion to what was suggested to him by others; that, in all that relates to form, his poetry, so far from having any pretension to originality, is essentially imitative. And yet this is certainly the case. We have already remarked that the

least satisfactory part of Mr Coleridge's commentary is its illustration of these very remarkable characteristics of Byron, and we shall therefore make no apology for dealing with them at some length.

Nothing could illustrate more strikingly Byron's method than 'Childe Harold' and the Eastern tales. It is generally supposed that in the 'Childe' Byron simply painted himself, and so in some touches and in certain details he undoubtedly did; but the character was plainly suggested to him by Madame de Staël's Lord Nelvil in 'Corinne,' in whom every trait of Byron's hero is defined and described. In the fourth canto 'Corinne' is followed very closely, as in the descriptions of the Coliseum and St Peter's, and in the reflections on the ruins of Rome. Nearly the whole of two of the finest stanzas (clxxxix, clxxx) in the apostrophe to the ocean is taken from the novel (I, iv):—

'... Cette superbe mer, sur laquelle l'homme jamais ne peut imprimer sa trace. La terre est travaillée par lui ... mais si les vaisseaux sillonnent un moment les ondes, la vague vient effacer aussitôt cette légère marque de servitude, et la mer reparait telle qu'elle fut au premier jour de la création.'

The famous stanza in Julia's letters, in the first canto of 'Don Juan,' st. exciv, 'Man's love is of man's life,' etc., is little more than a translation of 'Corinne,' XVIII, v:—

'Que les hommes sont heureux d'aller à la guerre, d'exposer leur vie, de se livrer à l'enthousiasme de l'honneur et du danger! Mais il n'y a rien au dehors qui soulage les femmes.'

The character of Conrad, in 'The Corsair,' was apparently concocted, as Alaric Watts pointed out, from that of Malefort Junior, in Massinger's 'Unnatural Combat,' and Mrs Anne Radcliffe's typical heroes. The Giaour is simply Mrs Radcliffe's Schedoni in 'The Italian.' In 'Lara' Byron no doubt analyses his own character; but for the rest the whole poem is concocted from Mrs Radcliffe's 'Italian' and 'Mysteries of Udolpho,' and from Scott's 'Marmion.' How closely Mrs Radcliffe is followed will be apparent to any one who compares the combat between Lara and Otho, and that between Mrs Radcliffe's Morano and Montoni in the second volume of the 'Mysteries of Udolpho.' Compare, for instance, with

Mrs Radcliffe, the passage in section iv of the second canto of 'Lara,' beginning

"Demand thy life!" . . .

For Lara's brow upon the moment grew

Almost to blackness in its demon hue.'

'The Count then fell back . . . while Montoni held his sword over him and bade him ask his life. . . . He yielded at the interruption, but his countenance changed almost to blackness as he looked.'

Indeed we continually trace the influence of Mrs Radcliffe's novels on Byron's poetry; he has borrowed from her hints for two of his most striking passages, the comparison of modern and ancient Greece to the features of the dead and the living:—

'Beyond Milan the country wore the aspect of a ruder devastation; and though everything seemed now quiet, the repose was like that of death spread over features which retain the impression of the last convulsions' ('Udolpho,' ii, 29);

and the description of Venice at the beginning of the fourth canto of 'Childe Harold':—

'Nothing could exceed Emily's admiration on her first view of Venice, with its islets, palaces, and towers rising out of the sea . . . its terraces, crowned with airy yet majestic fabrics, . . . appeared as if they had been called up from the ocean by the wand of an enchanter' (Id. ii, 59).

There can be little doubt that, in the remarkable poem entitled 'Darkness,' Byron was greatly indebted, as Herr Kölbing and Mr Coleridge have pointed out, to a once popular but long forgotten novel published in 1806, entitled 'The Last Man, or Omegarus and Syderia'; but what neither Herr Kölbing nor Mr Coleridge has noticed is that he was almost equally indebted to Burnet's 'Telluris Theoria Sacra,'* which he had certainly read, and from which he has borrowed details of singular picturesqueness not found in the novel, for example, the lines:—

'Ocean all stood still,

And nothing stirr'd within their silent depths;

Ships sailorless lay rotting on the sea, . . .

They slept on the abyss without a surge;

The waves were dead'

* See particularly lib. iii, cap. xii.

—which are simply a paraphrase of, 'Et quoad mare, hoc dudum deseruerunt nautæ, stagnum putidum sine motu.*' The plot of 'Werner,' 'the characters, plan, and even the language,' were taken, as he himself acknowledged, from the German's Tale in the 'Canterbury Tales' by the Misses Lee; as the plot of 'The Deformed Transformed' was borrowed mainly, also by his confession, from a long forgotten novel, entitled 'The Three Brothers,' by one Joshua Pickersgill.

The indebtedness of Byron in 'Manfred' to Goethe's 'Faust,' the greater part of which Lewis translated for him, and to the 'Prometheus' of Æschylus, is of course notorious, and is duly noted by Mr Coleridge. But what Mr Coleridge does not notice is the influence exercised on it by the romance of 'Ahasuerus,' by Southey's 'Curse of Kehama,' by Schiller's 'Robbers' and 'Death of Wallenstein,' both of which were accessible to Byron in translations,† and by Maturin's 'Bertram,' to say nothing of innumerable passages suggested by 'Paradise Lost.' Nor has Mr Coleridge noticed for how much of 'Don Juan' Byron was indebted to Casti's 'Novelle,' which, beyond all doubt, suggested the poem to him. He had been introduced to the 'Novelle' by Major Gordon at Brussels, in 1816; and in a letter written from Geneva, not long afterwards, he says, 'I cannot tell you what a treat your gift of Casti has been to me. I have almost got him by heart.‡' He began 'Don Juan' about two years afterwards. 'Don Juan' is full of reminiscences of the 'Novelle.' The novel which brings us nearest to Byron's poem is the one entitled 'La Diavolessa' (Novella iv). This suggested to him his hero.

'I'll therefore take our ancient friend Don Juan—
We all have seen him, in the pantomime,
Sent to the devil somewhat ere his time.'

So Casti :—

'Ma voi più volte, O Donne mie, vedeste
Sovra le scene pubbliche e private
Di don Giovan le scandalose geste.'

(St. xv.)

* Lib. iii, cap. xli.

† See the English translation of the first, published in 1795, and Coleridge's well-known version of the second, published in 1800.

‡ Letters and Journals, iv, 217, note.

In Casti's story one Don Ignazio (who is his hero) and Don Juan scour Spain in quest of licentious adventures, to meet afterwards in the infernal regions, whither, as we know from himself, Byron intended finally to conduct his hero. Ignazio, like Don Juan, was born in Seville, and

‘Traced his source
Through the most Gothic gentlemen of Spain.’

‘La nobil sua famiglia
Drittamente scendea fin dai re Goti.’

(St. ix.)

Both are extraordinarily precocious and addicted to the same frailties, Julia, the wife of Don Jose, standing in the same relation to Don Juan as Ermenegilda, the wife of his friend, to Ignazio, the one, however, voluntarily, the other involuntarily. Ignazio, like Don Juan, is shipwrecked; and each hero is the sole survivor. It is quite clear that Byron modelled his style, not on Berni, as he implied, but on Casti. To Casti, then, undoubtedly belongs the honour of having suggested and furnished Byron with a model for Don Juan. In point of distinction and merit, in brilliance, picturesqueness and power, there is, of course, no parallel between the two poets. To accuse Byron of plagiarism for the perfectly legitimate use of material or suggestion afforded by others would, we hasten to say, be as absurd as to bring a similar charge against Shakespeare for the use which he has made of Plutarch and Holinshed, or against Milton for the use which he has made of the ancients. As Swift well observes, ‘If I light my candle from another, that does not affect my property in the wick and tallow’; and of wick and tallow Byron had infinitely more than the majority of his creditors put together.

Byron's reading, if desultory, was unusually extensive and curious; and his memory, like that of Tennyson, extraordinarily tenacious and assimilative. To scholarship he had of course no pretension. The fact that, in his last years at school, we find him scribbling on the margins of his Xenophon and Greek plays the English equivalents for *νέοι*, *σώματα*, and *χρυσός*, is no doubt indicative of his acquaintance with Greek, for it does not appear that at a later time he made any effort to extend his knowledge of

that language.* But with most of the Greek classics in translations—Latin, probably, as well as English—he was certainly familiar, as the ready propriety with which applications or reminiscences of passages from them spring to his pen sufficiently shows. Of the ‘Prometheus,’ as he tells us himself, he ‘was passionately fond’; and this, at least, he knew well in the original, as it was one of the Greek plays which ‘we read thrice a year at Harrow,’ adding that ‘that and the “Medea” were the only ones, except the “Seven against Thebes,” which ever much pleased me.’ Many of the most striking of these reminiscences from Greek poetry have been duly noted by Mr Coleridge, but he has not observed that stanza *cciv* in the Haidee episode in the second canto in *Don Juan*, ‘And now ’twas done,’ etc., is almost a translation from the ‘Hero and Leander’ of the Pseudo-Musæus, 279–283; the resemblance between

‘Their priest was Solitude, and they were wed,’

and

Ἀλλὰ λῆχος στορέσασα . . .

Σιγὴ πᾶσιν ἔπηξεν,

being, with the other general resemblances, too close to admit of any likelihood of coincidence. That Byron read Latin fluently and habitually, and was well, if irregularly, acquainted with the Latin poets, there can be no doubt. We cannot enter into the question here, but will only add that for every illustration given by Mr Coleridge a dozen could be adduced by any one who had happened to pay particular attention to this subject. In addition to Lucretius, Catullus, Horace, Virgil, and Ovid, whom he seems to have known well, he had read Tibullus, Lucan, Juvenal, Persius, Valerius Flaccus, Seneca, and Claudian, from all of whom he has borrowed. Wherever, indeed, in the less known Latin poets, or in modern Latin literature, anything particularly felicitous occurs, the chances are that Byron was acquainted with it and has turned it to

* In his ‘Detached Thoughts’ (‘Letters and Journals,’ v, 436) he speaks of his classical attainments as being ‘in the usual proportion of a sixth-form boy.’ In those days boys were usually much more advanced in Latin than in Greek.

account. Thus the pretty description of a dimple by Terentius Varro, preserved by Nonius Marcellus—

*'Sigilla in mento impressa Amoris digitulo
Vestigio demonstrant mollitudinem'*

—which he probably found in Gray's 'Letters' (where it is wrongly attributed by West to Aulus Gellius)—he adapts, as he himself has noted, in 'Childe Harold':—

*'The seal Love's dimpling finger hath impress'd
Denotes how soft that chin which bears his touch.'*

He quotes Shenstone's exquisite inscription, '*Heu quanto minus est cum reliquis versari quam tui meminisse,*' Gray's exquisite Alcaic stanza, '*Fons lacrymarum,*' etc., Cowley's '*Nam vita gaudet mortua floribus*' in the '*Epitaphium vivi auctoris,*' and the felicitous epigram of Amaltheus, '*Lumine Acon dextro, capta est Leonilla sinistro,*' etc. Among the prose writers, Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus appear to have been his favourites; and scores of reminiscences from them may be found in his poems.

To pass from Byron's appropriations from the ancients to his appropriations from the moderns. He was so sensitive about being charged with plagiarism that he gave away, Mrs Shelley tells us, Aikin's edition of the British poets for fear some English traveller should find it in his house and report at home his possession of it; and when, in the '*Literary Gazette*' for February and March 1821, Mr Alaric A. Watts very amply illustrated with what justice such a charge could be brought against him, he was greatly annoyed. '*I think I now in my time,*' he wrote to Moore, '*have been accused of everything.*' But in another mood he owned that '*when he had got a good idea*' he was '*not very scrupulous how he came into possession of it.*' And this was true. It is undoubtedly part of the duty of a '*variorum*' editor to point out these appropriations; and this Mr Coleridge has to some extent succeeded in doing; so imperfectly, however, that we cannot but regret that he did not consult some one who would have assisted him to supply this deficiency. We have not space to give more than a few of the illustrations which Mr Coleridge might have noted.

Plagiarism, in the strict sense of the term, must be conscious and deliberate, but what may justly render

an author liable to the charge of it may be either coincidence or unconscious appropriation. Coincidence is not, as a rule, likely to be the case with Byron, for his memory was almost as remarkable as his genius, and from his boyhood he was an incessant reader. 'I read,' he said, 'eating, read in bed, and read when no one else reads.' When he was little more than a child he found at Dr Glennie's a complete set of the British poets from Chaucer to Churchill; 'and I am,' said Dr Glennie, 'almost tempted to say that he had perused them more than once from beginning to end.' His poetry throughout is saturated with what he had thus acquired. Many of his reminiscences are no doubt unconscious. Such, for instance, would be his echo of Campbell's,

 'The power of thought—the magic of a name,'
in

 'The power of grace, the magic of a name';
of Burns's,

 'I saw thy pulse's maddening play,'
in

 'The exulting sense, the pulse's maddening play';
of Scott's,

 'O for an hour of Wallace wight,'
in

 'O for one hour of blind old Dandolo';
of Tickell's,

 'I hear a voice you cannot hear,'
in

 'I hear a voice I would not hear';
of Pope's,

 'Glory of the priesthood and the shame,'
in

 'Tasso is now their glory and their shame.'

The echoes, we may add, from Spenser—the minor poems as well as the 'Faëry Queen'—of Young's tragedies, particularly the 'Revenge,' and of the Pseudo-Ossian, are innumerable. To Spenser's lines (F.Q. III, ii, 5)—

 'And ever and anon the rosy red
Flash'd through her face as it had been a flake
Of lightning through bright heaven fulminéd'

—he seems to have owed a singularly beautiful image in stanza lxi of the first canto of Don Juan :—

‘ Her cheek all purple with the beam of youth,
Mounting, at times, to a transparent glow,
As if her veins ran lightning.’

In the last line of ‘The Corsair’ (‘Link’d with one virtue, and a thousand crimes’) we have one of Byron’s many reminiscences of a book which was a great favourite with him, Burton’s ‘Anatomy of Melancholy.’ ‘Hannibal, as he had mighty virtues, so he had many vices; *unam virtutem mille vitia comitantur.*’ In ‘Churchill’s Grave,’ a noble expression of Dante’s (‘Inferno,’ xxxiii, 26–27) is laid under contribution :—

‘ Do we rip
The veil of immortality.’

‘ Il mal sonno
Che del futuro mi squarcia il velame.’

We will now give a few examples of Byron’s appropriations from more recondite sources, as they illustrate how keen an eye he had for anything which, being unusually felicitous, he could turn to account. Sir William Jones, in his essay on the poetry of the Eastern nations, observes that their similes are very just and striking, and gives as an instance, ‘The blue eyes of a fine woman bathed in tears compared to violets dropping with dew.’ This appears in Byron’s stanzas, ‘I saw thee weep’ :—

‘ The big bright tear
Came o’er that eye of blue;
And then methought it did appear
A violet dropping dew.’

In his dedication to the ‘Rival Ladies’ Dryden, speaking of the progress of the work, says :—

‘When it was only a confused mass of thoughts, tumbling over one another in the dark; when the fancy was yet in its first work, moving the sleeping images of things towards the light, there to be distinguished and then either chosen or rejected by the judgment.’

This reappears in 'Marino Faliero,' I, ii, as—

'As yet 'tis but a chaos
Of darkly brooding thoughts: my fancy is
In her first work, more nearly to the light
Holding the sleeping images of things,
For the selection of the pausing judgment.'

The remark in 'Don Juan,' IV, st. iv—

'And if I laugh at any mortal thing,
'Tis that I may not weep'

—looks very like a reminiscence of Richardson's 'Pamela' (Letter lxxxiv):—

'It is to this deep concern that my levity is owing. . . .
I am forced to try to make myself laugh that I may not cry.'

But he sometimes goes to more recondite sources, as in
'Childe Harold,' III, st. xix—

'Shall we, who struck the Lion down, shall we
Pay the Wolf homage?'

which appears to have been suggested by a sentence in the famous pamphlet, 'Killing No Murder,' attributed to Colonel Titus:—

'Shall we, who would not suffer the Lion to invade us,
tamely stand to be devoured by the Wolf?'

We have not space for further illustrations, though it would be easy to multiply them a hundred-fold. Let us consider their significance, for this is of the greatest importance in estimating Byron's work as a poet.

Of no man of genius can it be so truly said that he is of those whom Chapman admirably described as having

'Strange gifts from Nature, but no soul
Infused quite through to make them of a piece.'

His inspired power, his essential sincerity as a poet, lay partly in the intensity with which he felt and expressed the passions and realised all that in circumstance and situation appealed to them, and partly in what Matthew

* Harleian Miscellany, iv, 290 (ed. 1744).

Arnold has so happily designated his Titanism. The moment he quits these spheres he becomes a rhetorician, but a rhetorician so eloquent and moving, so brilliant and impressive, that the note of falsetto is not at first sight discernible. We see his power in quintessence in such passages as the journey and death of Hassan, Alp's journey along the beach, the death of Selim, the stanzas on Waterloo, the falls of Velino, the thunderstorm, the apostrophe to Rome, the dying gladiator, the last two stanzas of the shipwreck, and innumerable other passages in which these and similar notes are struck. But his serious poetry has not only no unity, it has not even permeating enthusiasm. Ecstasy exhausted and in collapse, mere talent succeeds to genius, the interstices between each effort of inspired energy being filled up by more or less successfully disguised falsetto.

In the other sphere, the sphere of satire and comedy, his masterpiece—and here his power is sustained—is 'The Vision of Judgment'; while in 'Don Juan' we have what we have nowhere else, the true, full man in absolute and naked simplicity, a comprehensive illustration of his amazing versatility and dexterity, of his genius for comedy and satire—perhaps his most remarkable characteristic—as well as of all those qualities of sincerity which inform and vitalise his serious poetry.

Byron's insincerity—in other words, his rhetoric and falsetto—is most discernible in those parts of his poetry which are in execution most brilliant, and which are generally singled out for special commendation by his admirers. First would come his descriptions of nature and his affectation of being Nature's devoted worshipper. It may fairly be questioned whether Byron was ever profoundly moved by Nature, or whether he ever regarded her in any other light than a theme for rhetorical display. In his earlier poems all his descriptions are perfectly commonplace and of the order of Shenstone's, who seems, judging from the 'Hours of Idleness,' to have been a favourite with him. In the first two cantos of 'Childe Harold' his descriptions are mere rhetoric. The Morean sunset in the third canto of 'The Corsair' is little more than a brilliant declamation. At last, in the third canto of 'Childe Harold,' the note changes; but it changes because, to employ his own expression,

Shelley 'had dosed him with Wordsworth.' From this moment Nature became a favourite, for he saw from Wordsworth what capital could be made out of such a theme; and 'description' being, as he himself boasted, 'his forte,' delineations of Nature fill thenceforward a very wide space in his poetry. Of their power and beauty there can be no question, but there can be as little question of the purely rhetorical quality of much of this part of his work. Not, however, of all of it, for affectation passes at once into inspired sincerity the moment he deals with such phases of Nature as respond to his own moods. He 'loved her,' he tells us, 'best in wrath'; and in her wrath and her awe-compelling forms of sublimity and grandeur she took possession of him and made him her prophet. There is no note of falsetto, or, if there appears to be such a note, it is only in clumsiness of expression, when his themes are the falls of Velino, or the thunderstorm in the Alps, or the elemental wastes of mountain or of ocean, or the ravages of death and time.

His falsetto becomes at once apparent when, in wholesale plagiarisms from Wordsworth, he adopts Wordsworth's metaphysical philosophy; because it is quite evident that, so far from believing in it, he did not even comprehend it. He saw how happily it lent itself to effective rhetoric, but he did not see how incongruous was the essential materialism of his own conception of life and nature with conceptions as essentially transcendental. When he writes—

*Inaccusate
See Letter
to Miss Milbank*

I live not in myself, but I become

Portion of that around me . . .

And thus I am absorbed, and this is life.

Are not the mountains, waves, and skies a part
Of me and of my soul, as I of them?

Not a beam, nor air, nor leaf is lost
But hath a part of being, and a sense
Of that which is of all Creator and defence'

—we instinctively feel that it is what the Greeks so happily called *parenthyrsos*.

It is in these parts of his poetry that his adaptations and appropriations from other poets are most frequent and palpable, notably from the Pseudo-Ossian, from Beattie's

'Minstrel,' from Wordsworth and Coleridge. But he often goes much further afield. It is well known that one of his favourite books was Burton's 'Anatomy of Melancholy'; and there can be little doubt that he turned passages in it to good account more than once in 'Childe Harold' (for instance, in canto II, st. xxv) in describing the pleasures and solaces of Nature.

'To walk among orchards, gardens, bowers, mounts and arbours, artificial wildernesses, green thickets, arches, groves, lawns, rivulets, fountains, and such like pleasant places . . . betwixt wood and water, in a fair meadow, by a river side . . . to disport in some pleasant plain, run up a steep hill, or sit in a shady seat, must needs be a delectable recreation.' ('Anatomy,' part ii, § ii, m. 4.)

Such parallels may, of course, be merely accidental coincidences; but there can be no doubt—and it is on this only that we wish to insist—that Byron, in describing Nature in her calmer aspects, where there was nothing to arouse passion, and in expressing sympathy with her in such aspects, invariably drew both his descriptions and his sentiments from books.

It is precisely the same with his brilliant descriptions of masterpieces in the plastic arts—the Venus de Medici, the Laocoon, the Apollo Belvidere. Now we have it on the authority of Rogers that Byron was, like Scott, without any feeling for the fine arts. In his letter to Murray, dated April 26, 1817, Byron does, indeed, express himself with some enthusiasm about what he saw in the galleries of Florence, but he observes of the Venus de Medici that it is 'more for admiration than love.' We turn to his description and find it little more than an eloquent paraphrase of the famous passage at the beginning of the first book of Lucretius, the passion-inspiring voluptuousness of the work being especially, and indeed solely, dwelt upon; while he dovetails into it a reminiscence of a passage in Young's 'Revenge' (v, ii)—a tragedy evidently well known to him, as he borrows from it more than once elsewhere:—

'Where hadst thou this, Enchantress? . . .

E'en now thou swimm'st before me. . . .

Who spread that pure expanse of white above,

On which the dazzled sight can find no rest,

But, drunk with beauty, wanders up and down?'

Not the 'Apollo Belvidere' itself, but Milman's fine Newdigate was plainly the model and inspiration of the magnificent description of that statue, though Byron may also have drawn, as Milman certainly did, on the description of the statue in Isaac Disraeli's 'Flim-flams' (vol. iii, cap. 44)—a work well known to Byron.

Keats, with characteristic insight, once described Byron as 'a fine thing in the worldly, theatrical, and pantomimical way'; and this description, with some modification, almost always applies to him when he attempts what he attempts, for example, in 'Manfred.' That work may indeed be taken as a comprehensive illustration both of his falsetto and of what redeems that falsetto from contempt. The drama as a whole is mere fustian, a chaotic concoction from what has been suggested by other poets, with a substratum of the impressions really made on him by the scenery of Switzerland, recorded in his journal to Mrs Leigh.

He was no doubt anxious to have it supposed that Manfred was drawn from himself, and that Manfred's crimes and remorse had their counterparts in his own; and this Goethe was induced to believe.* But beyond a generic resemblance in certain superficial qualities, Manfred has no more resemblance to Byron than he has to any other human being. He is partly a poor copy of Goethe's Faust, with touches of Æschylus's Prometheus and Milton's Satan, partly of Beattie's Edwin and Shelley's Alastor, partly of Schiller's Moor in 'Die Räuber,' to which Byron had access either in a French version or in the English translation of 1795,† partly of Southey's Ladurlad when under the curse, and partly of Mrs Radcliffe's Schedoni and Ahasuerus.

And as is the protagonist—a thing of shreds and patches—such is the whole drama. Resolved into its constituent parts, the opening scene, the machinery of Spirits, the incantation, the scenes with the Chamois Hunter, the soliloquies and their surroundings, the intervention of the Abbot, and Manfred's relations with him—

* See his letter to Knebel, October 1817.

† In the journal to Mrs Leigh ('Letters and Journals,' iii, 356) he speaks of reading 'a French translation of Schiller.' The reminiscences of William Tell in 'Manfred' are obvious; and this, and not 'The Robbers,' may be what he refers to.

there is no portion of it which cannot be traced to pre-existing poems or fictions. The drama has neither unity, soul, nor motive. Indeed it is part of the falsetto that for intelligible motive is substituted juggling mystification, just as we find in 'Lara.' But as is usual with Byron's falsetto, the vigour of the rhetoric in the descriptions and soliloquies half disguises it. Every one must be arrested by the eloquence of the soliloquy which opens the second scene of the first act, by the impassioned appeal to Astarte, and by the impressive picture of the Coliseum. What is true of 'Manfred' is true of the other 'metaphysical' dramas. Byron was no philosopher, and in all these works he illustrates what Goethe so truly said of him, that so soon as he began to reflect he was a child.

It is when we compare these works with 'The Vision of Judgment' and 'Don Juan,' and with such poems and such passages in poems as found their inspiration in what sincerely moved him, that we measure the distance between Byron the rhetorician and Byron the poet, between degrees of talent and the pure accent of genius. A large proportion, perhaps two thirds, of Byron's poetry resolves itself into the work of an extraordinarily gifted craftsman, with a rhetorical talent as brilliant and plastic as Dryden's, working on the material furnished by an unusually wide experience of life, by sleepless observation, and by a marvellously assimilative and retentive memory, incessantly if desultorily adding to its stores. No English poet, not Milton, not Gray, not Tennyson, owed more to reading than Byron, or had a mind more saturated with acquired knowledge. It is on this aspect of his work that a review of his collected writings, now for the first time furnished with notes and commentaries, might with propriety be expected to dwell; and it is on this aspect of them, therefore, that we have principally dwelt.

But let us not mistake. Whatever deduction may result from discrimination between what is original and what is derivative, between what is sound and excellent and what is unsound or of inferior quality in Byron's work, the truth remains that he occupies, and for ever must occupy, a place of extraordinary distinction in our literature. Shakespeare excepted, his versatility is without parallel among English poets. There is scarcely any

form or phase open to the poetic art which was not attempted by him, or any theme capable of poetic treatment which he did not handle. There is not a note characteristic of the poetry of the eighteenth century, or of the early nineteenth century, which he does not strike. He was the disciple of Dryden and Pope; he was the disciple of Shenstone and Gray, of Beattie and the Pseudo-Ossian; he was the disciple of Scott and Wordsworth. He drew largely on Æschylus and Milton; he drew largely on the Old Testament. He identified himself with Dante, and, catching his inspiration, has enriched our literature with a poem worthily recalling much of what is most moving and most noble in the 'Divine Comedy.' With equal facility and success his marvellously plastic genius assimilated also that species of poetry which lies at the opposite extreme of Italian art; and the mock-heroic of the Pulci, of Ariosto, and of Casti will, in point of humour and pathos, of wit and eloquence, bear no comparison with that of their English imitator. In the dramas generally, but more particularly in the historical dramas, the influence of Alfieri is plainly perceptible. Nor was it in England and Italy only that he sought for inspiration and models.

But if Byron's versatility is illustrated by the heterogeneity of the sources of his works, it is illustrated still more strikingly by those works themselves. Since Shakespeare, as Scott justly observes, no English poet has shown himself so great a master in the essentials of comedy and in the essentials of tragedy. In his comedy, it is true, there is no refinement, no geniality, and much that is brutal and gross; in his tragedy large deductions have to be made for insincerity and falsetto. But all that comedy, at least in its less refined, all that tragedy, at least in its less exalted, aspects can excite, will be for ever at the command of a master whose name instantly calls up 'Beppo,' 'The Vision of Judgment,' the first, thirteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth cantos of 'Don Juan,' many passages in the earlier narratives and Eastern tales, 'The Prisoner of Chillon,' the episodes of the shipwreck, and the death of Haidee.

His range in composition is indeed extraordinary. He was a brilliant disciple of the school of Pope in 'English Bards and Scotch Reviewers,' and in the 'Hints

from Horace'; the superior of Scott in a species of poetry peculiarly characteristic of the modern romantic school, in which, till his appearance, Scott reigned alone; the originator, in 'The Corsair,' 'Lara,' and the Oriental tales, of a new species of epic; the originator, in 'Cain' and in 'Heaven and Earth,' of a new and most striking species of drama, and in 'Manfred' of a species which had, with the exception of a work unknown to him, Marlowe's 'Faustus,' no prototype or counterpart in our literature. 'Sardanapalus,' to say nothing of 'Marino Faliero' and 'The Two Foscari,' may be below contempt as a drama, but it is a splendid exhibition of dramatic rhetoric. As satire in mock-heroic, 'The Vision of Judgment' has neither equal nor second in European literature. Inferior in quality as his lyric poetry is to that of many of his predecessors, and to that of many more of his contemporaries and successors, it would be impossible to name any poet in our language out of whose work an anthology so splendid and multiform could be compiled.

To pass to his masterpieces; 'Childe Harold' and 'Don Juan,' regarded comprehensively, are perhaps the two most brilliant achievements in the poetry of the world, and they are achievements which have nothing in common. Each moves in a sphere of its own, as each exhibits powers differing not in degree merely, but in kind. 'Childe Harold' is a superb triumph partly of pure rhetoric and partly of rhetoric touched with inspired enthusiasm. In 'Don Juan' we are in another world and under the spell of another genius. The sentimentalist has passed into the cynic, the moralist into the mocker. We are no longer in the temples and palaces of poetry, but in its profane places and meaner habitations. The theme now is not Nature in her glory, but humanity in its squalor; not the world as God made it, but as the devil rules it. For the series of splendid pageants, for the raptures and sublimities of its predecessor, has been substituted, in broad, free fresco, the tragic farce into which man's lusts and lawlessness, madness and follies, have perverted life. It was into this mock-heroic that Byron, disengaging himself from all that vanity had induced him to affect, and from all that his cleverness and command of rhetoric had enabled him to assume, poured out his powers in sheer and abso-

lute sincerity—the Titanism which was of the very essence of his genius, the scorn and mockery, the wit, the persiflage, the irony, ‘the sense of tears in human things,’ the brutal appetites, the more refined affections which still held him under their sway.

‘Don Juan’ is admirable alike in conception, in range, in expression. To give unity to a work which blends all that amuses and entertains us in ‘Lazarillo de Tormes,’ ‘Gil Blas,’ the ‘Novelle Amoroſe,’ and Horace Walpole’s ‘Letters,’ much of what impresses and charms us in the ‘Odyssey’ and the ‘Æneid,’ which has all the cynicism of La Rochefoucauld and Swift, all the callous levity of the worst school of our comedy, and yet subdues us with a pathos which has now the note of Ecclesiastes and now the note of Catullus—this indeed required a master-hand. The unity of the poem is the unity impressed on it by truth, by truth to nature and truth to life, for Byron in writing it did but hold up the mirror to himself and his own experiences.

‘What an antithetical mind!’ (he himself wrote after reading certain letters of Burns)—‘tenderness, roughness, delicacy, coarseness, sentiment, sensuality, soaring and grovelling, dirt and deity, all mixed up in that one compound of inspired clay.’

Such in fact was Byron himself, and such is this poem, the glory and the shame of our poetry. But if much is to be forgiven to one who loves greatly, something may be forgiven to one who hates rightly. The justification of ‘Don Juan’ is its ruthless exposure of some of the most despicable characteristics of the English people: the ubiquity of hypocrisy, the ubiquity of cant; immorality masking as morality, and ceremony as religion, for the vilest purposes, the one to make capital out of the frailties and lapses of those who are at least sincere, the other as a means for dignifying almost every form which moral cowardice and moral vanity can assume.

In its execution ‘Don Juan’ deserves all the praise which Byron’s most extravagant admirers have heaped on it. Never was our language so completely clay in the artist’s hands. Whatever he has to express seems to embody itself spontaneously in the complicated form of verse which he has chosen. With a skill and ease which,

in our literature at least, are unrivalled, he has blended every extreme in nature and life, in style and tone, without producing the effect either of incongruity or even of impropriety. 'Don Juan' has little enough in common with the 'Odyssey,' and yet in some respects it recalls it. In both poems the similitude which at once suggests itself is the element so closely associated with the action of both—the sea. A freshness, a breeziness, a pungency as of the brine-laden air of beach or cliff seems to pervade it. Over the spacious expanse of its narrative, teeming with life and in ever-changing play, now in storm and now in calm, roll and break, wave after wave in endless succession, the incomparable stanzas on whose lilt and rush we are swept along.

The importance of Byron in English poetry is not to be estimated by ordinary critical tests; it is not by its quality that his work is to be judged. The application of perfectly legitimate criteria to his poetry would justify us in questioning whether he could be held to stand high even among the 'Dii minores' of his art; it would certainly result in assigning him a place very much below Wordsworth and Shelley, and even below Keats. Of many, nay, of most of the qualities essential in a poet of a high order, there is no indication in anything he has left us. Of spiritual insight he has nothing; of morality and the becoming, except in their coarser aspects, he has no sense. If the beautiful appealed to him, it appealed to him only in its material expression and sentimentally as it affected the passions. Of no poet could it be said with so much truth—and how much does that truth imply!—that he had not 'music in his soul.' Turn where we will in his work, there is no repose, no harmony; all is without balance, without measure, and, if we except 'Don Juan,' without unity. At his worst he sinks below Peter Pindar; at his best his accent is never that of the greatest masters. A certain ingrained coarseness, both in taste and feeling, which became more emphasised as his powers matured, not only made him insensible of much which appeals to the poet as distinguished from the rhetorician, but is accountable for the jarring notes, the lapses into grossness, and the banalities which so often surprise and distress us in his poetry.

As an artist, his defects are equally conspicuous. In architectonic he is as deficient as Tennyson. 'Childe Harold' and 'Don Juan,' as well as his minor narratives, simply resolve themselves into a series of pageants or episodes. No eminent English poet, with the exception of Browning, had so bad an ear. His cacophonies are often horrible; his blank-verse is generally indistinguishable from prose; and his rhythm in rhymed verse is without delicacy and full of discords. Every solecism in grammar, every violation of syntax and of propriety of expression, might be illustrated from his diction and style. Nor is this all. His claim to originality can only be conceded with much modification in its important aspects, and with very much more modification in the less important.

These are large deductions to make; and yet Goethe placed Byron next to Shakespeare among the English poets; and in fame and popularity, by the consentient testimony of every nation in Europe, next to Shakespeare among Shakespeare's countrymen, he still stands. Such a verdict it is much more easy to understand than to justify. To his countrymen Byron's flaws and limitations will always be more perceptible and important than they will be to the people of the Continent; while, in all that appeals to humanity at large, his work will come more nearly home on the other side of the Channel than that of any other English poet except Shakespeare; and necessarily so. Byron's poetry originally was not so much an appeal to England as to Europe. His themes, his characters, his inspiration, his politics, his morals, were all derived from the Continent or from the East. England was little more than the incarnation of everything against which he reacted, at first with contempt and then in fury. The trumpet-voice of the world of the Revolution and of the revolt against the principles of the Holy Alliance, it was on the Continent that he found most response. And there indeed he can never cease to be popular. The laureate of its scenery, the rhapsodist of its traditions, the student and painter of almost every phase of its many-sided life, the poet of the passions which burn with fiercer fire in the South than in the colder regions of the North, he neither has nor is likely to have, with the single exception of Shakespeare, an English rival across the Channel.

The greatness of Byron lies in the immense body and mass of the work which he has informed and infused with life, in his almost unparalleled versatility, in the power and range of his influential achievement. Youth and mature age are alike his debtors. There is not a passion, scarcely an emotion, scarcely a mood, to which he does not appeal, and to which he has not given expression. Of almost every side of life, of almost every phase of human activity, he has left us studies more or less brilliant. He had, in extraordinary measure, nearly every gift, intellectually speaking, which man can possess, from mere cleverness to inspired genius; and there was hardly any species of composition which he did not more or less successfully attempt. As Goethe and Wordsworth were the Olympians, so he was the Titan of the stormy and chaotic age in which he lived; and his most authentic poetry is typical of his temper and attitude. He has impressed on our literature the stamp of a most fascinating and commanding personality, and on the literature of every nation in Europe he has exercised an influence to which no other British writer except Shakespeare has even approximated. Such is the intrinsic power and attraction of a great part of his poetry that he will always be a favourite—if not in the first rank of their favourites—with his countrymen; and, although no purely critical estimate would place him on a level with at least five, if not more, of our poets, yet it must be admitted that, next to Shakespeare, he would probably be most widely missed.

J. C. COLLINS.

ART VI.—TWO GREAT CHURCHMEN.

1. *Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton, D.D., sometime Bishop of London.* By his Wife. Two vols. London: Longmans, 1904.
2. *Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon, D.D.* By John Octavius Johnston, M.A. London: Longmans, 1904.

By a coincidence, which is none the less impressive because manifestly undesigned, the biographies of two great churchmen have been published almost simultaneously. One was undoubtedly the greatest preacher of his age, a scholar, a divine, a saint, and essentially a priest; the other, if not the greatest prelate, was at any rate a man who, for variety of gifts, moral and intellectual, and for versatility in their application to the service of God and man, has rarely had his equal on the episcopal bench. The lives of these two men were as unlike as their natures. We shall institute no direct comparison between them. Their country and their Church are the richer for the memory and the example of both. It would be easy, and yet quite unjust, to say that, from one point of view, the one was a saint and the other a worldling. It would be quite as easy, and equally unjust, to say that, from another point of view, the one was above all things a man and the other above all things a priest. These are the superficial contrasts which naturally occur to any one according as he is more in sympathy with the one type of character or with the other. But they do not go to the root of the matter. Perhaps the root is not to be discovered. The priesthood which absorbs manhood is one type of human character, and, comparatively speaking, a common one; the manhood which transcends priesthood is another and a much rarer one. The category which includes and reconciles both has yet to be framed. Liddon's philosophy affords no clue. Creighton's would fain seek, though he never may find it.

'I admire Jowett's sermons,' he says in one of his letters. 'I admire Liddon's, but I cannot say of either of them as their admirers do, "Lo, here is the whole truth, there is nothing else." Both of them embody part of the truth,

neither of them is universal. You know my bane is hankering after a universal system; I cannot be content speculatively, though I am practically quite easily, with the best that I can see; hence my constant inconsistencies. I take what I can get, but I cannot lose myself in that and say "That is all" (i. 122).

That is not the root of the matter, perhaps, but it is nearer to it than Liddon ever got, or than those who think and feel with Liddon are ever likely to get.

The personalities of the two men are not more sharply contrasted than the methods of their respective biographers. Liddon's biography is the life of a priest written by a priest; by one, indeed, whose religious ideals are no doubt the same as those of Liddon himself, who is in full sympathy with his ecclesiastical and theological aims, who took part in the great literary labour of his life—the biography of Pusey—and completed it after his death. These are high and rare qualifications. Nevertheless the portrait of the man within the priest, of the gentle, kindly, courteous, cultivated personality which filled the Christ Church common-room with sweetness and light, and fascinated all who came into social contact with him, is not to be found on Mr Johnston's own canvas. It is sketched, indeed, with delicate sympathy in a few pages contributed to the volume by Mr Sampson, a Christ Church colleague, and in a final appreciation of wider scope, for which Mr Johnston is indebted to the graceful pen of the Bishop of Oxford. But these appreciations, though welcome and not inadequate in themselves, are not interwoven into the texture of the biography. They stand outside and apart, and the main features remain those of the eager, combative, uncompromising ecclesiastic. There are many, perhaps, by whom this method of delineation will be held to be appropriate, satisfactory, and even inevitable. If such there are, we cannot share their views. Great indeed is the power of oratory, especially of pulpit oratory; and in this sphere of activity, in the sway exercised over men's minds and feelings by rhetoric such as his, by a pure and lofty character clothing its religious emotions in the guise of a logic uncompromising and to all seeming irresistible, Liddon had no rival; but he would never have been the great force that he was if he had not been something

more than the polemical preacher and priest whom Mr Johnston delineates.

The biography of Creighton pursues a very different and a much more difficult method. It aims at nothing less than presenting the complete portrait of a man, and in that arduous enterprise—seldom more arduous than in the case of such a man as Creighton was—it achieves a very large measure of success. 'There are many who think,' says Mrs Creighton in her preface, 'that a man's life should never be written by one very near to him, and least of all by his wife.' The opinion is a common one; and the rule it embodies is one to which there are not likely to be many exceptions. Biography is at all times one of the most difficult of literary undertakings. It demands on the ethical side a combination of sympathy with detachment; on the literary side a sense of proportion, a gift of composition, and a grace of presentation and expression such as are rarely united with the power of self-effacement which is necessary to give the subject due prominence and to keep the writer in the background. It is easy to see that a wife or a near relative is rarely likely to combine all these qualifications. Very often such biographers are without any of them. They may have the requisite knowledge, as Mrs Creighton justly claims for herself, but they have no power of using it. In such cases the rule unquestionably holds good. But such exceptions as there are must needs be brilliant exceptions, for where the requisite knowledge goes hand in hand with the other and far higher qualifications needed in a biographer, no one is more likely to combine them with greater skill and success than a man's wife. Mrs Creighton is assuredly one of these exceptions.

It will be seen from what we have said that the biographies of Creighton and of Liddon are in no sense *in pari materia*. They admit of no common measure, being in truth as incommensurate and heterogeneous as the two men themselves. We have used them to point a contrast which is obvious, but it would not be profitable, and it would be invidious, to institute an elaborate comparison between them. It might be easy to show from Liddon's biography how the exaltation of the priestly office tends to the weakening of the more virile fibres of character; how the stern and unbending logic of the

dogmatic theologian results in a dialectic which has no message for the unconverted. From this we might deduce an explanation of Liddon's really astonishing and almost abject submission to Dr Pusey; of his mental agony over such matters as the Jerusalem bishopric, and the mild concessions to the spirit of historical criticism made by the authors and the editor of 'Lux Mundi'; of his painful searchings of heart whenever the whisper came within his hearing of his possible elevation to a higher position in the Church. But we are not concerned with an analysis of Liddon's personality and character on the present occasion. His biography has served our purpose in the comparison which it cannot but suggest in the circumstances. Yet, except in detail, it adds little to what we knew before. It is not like the biography of Creighton, a revelation and an explanation of much which, to all but those who were nearest and dearest to him, was far withdrawn if not unsuspected, and by every one else was misinterpreted if not entirely misunderstood. For that reason we shall devote the remainder of this article to the consideration of Creighton's biography alone, and principally of those more intimate parts of it which were not accessible when we attempted to appreciate the Bishop's character shortly after his death ('Quarterly Review,' April 1901).

Throughout his life the characteristic of Creighton which most impressed the superficial observer was his astonishing intellectual power—the grasp, reach, and penetration of his mind. No one could come in contact with him at any time of his life without recognising his intellectual superiority to at least nine tenths of the men he had ever known. The late Archbishop of Canterbury—no prodigal of eulogy—said of him, 'For sheer cleverness Creighton beats any man I know.' Those who knew him in his earlier days at school or at college, or afterwards at Embleton, at Cambridge, at Worcester, or at Peterborough, would have said the same thing. What he was at the last, that he was essentially from the very first. There was progress and development, of course, there was assiduous cultivation and maturing of his native powers, but there was no organic change. 'The Merton undergraduate,' says Mrs Creighton, 'was in all essential respects the same man as the Bishop of London,' and

what the Bishop of London was we may learn from Lord Rosebery, another man who is not lavish of eulogy nor unmeasured in its expression. He was 'perhaps the most alert and universal intelligence that existed in this island at the time of his death.' But mere intellectual power, however great and commanding, however alert and universal, does not make the man that Creighton was. What else was there? That is the question which his career answered in a sense, and which his biography answers in a fuller sense, though there were many of his contemporaries who were never able to answer it at all. There were always some who thought that there was nothing else, that Creighton was merely an immensely clever man, clever enough, indeed, to occupy any position, but with no settled convictions, flippant, and fond of epigram, ready to argue with equal brilliancy and equal indifference on any side of any subject, and not ashamed to employ his cleverness as a cloak for his lack of earnestness and sincerity. Well that is a view of his character which casual and outside observers, with little insight and not much charity, might be excused for entertaining. Creighton 'never wore his spiritual heart on his sleeve,' says a friend and contemporary of his early Oxford days, 'and for this reason many thought he had none to wear.' It is certain that he was often flippant, and always fond of epigram and even of paradox. Perhaps at all times he had too little regard for the weaker brethren who would answer the question, '*ridentem dicere verum quid vetat?*' with a solemn frown. So again he often did talk so freely on every side of a subject as to encourage a suspicion that he neither knew nor cared on which side of it the truth lay, nor what relation it bore, if any, to his own opinions and convictions. But all this is explained by Mrs Creighton in a very illuminating passage:—

'This reserve as regards his real opinions, combined with his enjoyment of paradox and an inclination to what seemed to many flippancy in speech, led to his being much misunderstood. . . . Few recognised that, a true Cumbrian at bottom, he was fundamentally then, as always, a man of profound and proud reserve. His easy sympathetic sociability, his humour and his ready powers of expression, absolutely disguised this fundamental reserve. . . . I think that one reason

why he was often misunderstood, both then and in after-life, was that he never troubled about what people thought of him. He was absolutely unselfconscious, and had that kind of simplicity, produced by a want of selfconsciousness, with which no one ever credits a clever man, and which sometimes leads to his being called egotistical. He was too much interested and amused by the subject he was discussing, the ideas he was playing with, to consider whether he was shocking his hearers or not. If anything humorous occurred to him it had to come out; he did not stop to ask himself whether it might be misunderstood. But it is certain that he puzzled people' (i, 55, 56).

This passage goes far to explain why, as one of his friends records, 'no man of his time was so constantly, so freely, and so variously canvassed, not always favourably, but invariably as a rare and strange portent not to be readily classified in any familiar category of human nature'; and why at the shooting-lodge of one of his friends in Scotland it was proposed in fun to levy a fine on any one who mentioned his name. It explains why he was almost inevitably misunderstood by all who had never caught a glimpse of his inner and deeper nature. The secrets of his heart and soul were closely guarded and yet carelessly withal; for, though he was reserved by nature, he was also by nature too simple, too sincere, too inflexibly honest with himself and others, too incapable of intellectual posing, to cultivate reserve as a cloak. Probably he thought that what was so transparent to himself could not be so impenetrable to others as in most cases it undoubtedly was. He generally saw deeper into other people's natures than most of them had ever seen themselves, and no doubt he imputed his own penetration to others. He could have told many of them much that it would have profited them to know; but his reserve kept him silent unless he had a clear call to speak. Thus what he saw so clearly in others, namely, the depths and the limitations of their nature, he expected others to see not less clearly in himself, and probably believed that they did so.

There were some indeed who never misunderstood him. Those were they to whom circumstances and sympathy had early afforded an insight into the deeper secrets of his heart and soul—who knew him to be as good as

he was clever, as wise as he was witty, as inflexibly loyal to his own deepest convictions as he was tolerant of all opinions, and ready to discuss them with a freedom so unrestrained as to suggest absolute indifference. Yet where this insight was lacking he must inevitably have seemed, as he did seem to many, to be a paradox incarnate, just one of those men who are clever enough for anything, and not good enough to refrain from being that which they never ought to be. He knew very well that this was the way in which many people regarded him; and it was characteristic of him that he never took the trouble to undeceive them.

For instance, many who either did not know him or could not divine him were surprised when he took orders. To those who did know him it would have been a much greater surprise if he had done anything else. He was predestined for active service in the Church. We know now, what few suspected in his lifetime, that he had his *Wanderjahre*, a period of spiritual storm and stress through which he had to pass before he could attain to that permanent self, as he phrased it, to that sure outlook on life and his relation to it which was ever afterwards the mainspring of all he thought and did. But the crisis was moral rather than intellectual; and it does not appear that he was ever very seriously troubled by those speculative difficulties which, during the period from 1860 to 1880, made it impossible for so many of the ablest young men in Oxford either to take orders or even to accept the Christian faith in any form then regarded as orthodox. His early faith in the unseen was never shaken to its foundations as it was in so many of his contemporaries. In the outcome, he reached the conviction that there was no explanation of the riddle of the painful earth so satisfying or so convincing withal as that which Christianity affords; that in fact the highest aspirations of the human soul are essentially at one with the fundamental tenets of the Christian faith, since both are complementary manifestations of the divine will and purpose. In other words, he approached the Christian faith rather from the ethical than from the speculative side; or, to put it in the language of the schools, he held with Kant that in this order of ideas the practical reason is the complement and correction of the pure reason.

There may be many who can find no rest for their souls in such an attitude as this ; but no man is entitled to impute intellectual dishonesty, still less moral obliquity, to those who can. Anyhow his resolve to take orders was early formed and never seriously shaken.

'He told me' (says Mrs Creighton) 'that this had always been his intention from boyhood, and his schoolfellows record the fact that the resolution was already taken when he was at school. Home influence was not in its favour. . . . The decision appears to have been entirely the boy's own, uninfluenced by any one from without' (i, 10).

It was inherent in his character and in his way of looking at life. That we can see plainly enough from what he called his 'pastoral,' a long letter written a year or more after he left school, to a friend who had succeeded him as head of the school, 'on the duties of the monitors and the best way of fulfilling them.' There is no cant about this pastoral, not a trace of priggishness or self-righteousness, and it makes very little direct appeal to religious motives and sanctions.

'And now, if you ask me *how* you are to do all this, I am sure you will all feel where the best help is to be found ; also you will find a frequent attendance at the Holy Communion a very great assistance to you indeed' (i, 14).

That is all, but it is enough. Religion is the root of the matter, and it bears fruit in a passion for right conduct and a keen sense of responsibility.

—
'A monitor's duty, then, is to try and benefit the school in every way he can, especially morally ; a schoolboy can do nothing, of course, for the teaching of his fellows, but he can do everything for their moral good. You monitors have now before you a chance, which you never can have again, of benefiting or injuring (for if you do not do one you *must* do the other) very many of your fellows. Boys are very easily turned and guided : a kind look, a kind word, a piece of advice from one of you may, humanly speaking, be the means of determining for good the course of many a boy's life ; a few words of advice may often be the turning-point to a boy hard-pressed by temptations. One never feels this enough at the time ; one never knows, or, at any rate, never recognises

enough, that every glance of our eye is either a blessing or a curse to every one on whom it falls. It is a very serious responsibility which you have taken upon yourselves; if any of you has not as yet regarded it in any more serious light than a matter of course, which happens to any fellow who gets near the head of the school, let me beg of him to think some more this very night' (i, 11).

A youth who could write thus at the age of twenty was manifestly predestined for the pastoral office, unless, indeed, he made shipwreck of the faith that inspired and sustained him; and that assuredly Creighton never did, though we know now that his spiritual life was not at all times serene and undisturbed by storms. His was the '*anima naturaliter christiana*' no doubt. But there came a time to him, as it comes to all pure, strong, and eager souls, when his traditional beliefs had to be brought under the law of reason, when what his soul rejoiced in his intellect had to confirm. The struggle was, by his own confession, a severe one; but we know that its issue left unshaken the moral foundations of his being and the intellectual superstructure of his faith. The only record of it is to be found in that intimate correspondence with his wife before their marriage which Mrs Creighton, with rare candour and courage, and yet with perfect discretion, has given to the world in the biography. Elsewhere there is little or no trace of it. That is a battle which the soul of true nobility fights for itself and alone; and when it has been fought and won the experience of the conflict is too intimate and painful, and too exclusively personal withal, for its revelation to be either profitable or becoming. Confessions of this sort were repugnant to Creighton's whole theory of life. His spiritual nature was too robust and, at the same time, too reserved for him to set much store by the familiar interchange of what are called religious experiences. Religion with him was not a garment to be held up and displayed as though to make sure that it was of the regulation pattern. It was the immediate vesture of his soul, painfully fashioned by a travail of which none but himself could know the bitterness. He would help others to fashion a like vesture for themselves in like manner; but, as no two souls are the same either in their nature, their trials, or their individual needs, he knew that the agony of the conflict must

be endured and the peace of victory attained by themselves alone. All this he puts very plainly in one of those wonderful letters:—

'I notice that many young men who have got to rational beliefs (I must plead guilty to this crime myself sometimes) very often dwell more in conversation on the traditions they have abandoned than on the truths they have attained. That is natural, because the traditions stand out clear, they have rationally abolished them, and they think them noxious; but the truths they have got they hold in an individual form. It is hard to give them a general expression; to put them before another without giving a false impression, or else becoming more personally serious than ordinary society admits of: moreover their system has been built up upon their own moral nature, and to explain it requires immense confessions' (i, 112).

There we have the now open secret of Creighton's spiritual life. A little more light is thrown on it by a few other passages in the same series of letters; and two further extracts may here be given:—

'Either the world moves according to certain laws or it moves by chance. Mankind, on gazing round the world, has always observed certain great laws regulating great phenomena; these he has called laws of nature in the present day; and the question between different kinds of thinkers at the present day is whether by "Nature" we mean a hard, stern, inexorable fate, or a wise and bountiful Providence. I don't see how one is to split the difference; one or other must be the case. I happen to prefer the latter hypothesis, perhaps from cowardice, perhaps from conviction . . . but mainly, I think, because it is the only thing that makes life at all possible to me. . . . Having got one's Providence, I see clearly in history how mankind has worked under its direction always in the way of progress; I see that progress has always been that of the universal humanity, not of the individual man; consequently I don't object, from this point of view, to anything that befalls me. . . . The laws that regulate the moral world exist as much as those of the physical. . . . The Divine government of the world no more requires "personal interference" than it does perpetual miracles. The laws of nature are standing miracles; the laws of human conduct may be equally gathered and obeyed, and, when perceived, are just as much regulated by God, and calling for our trust in Him, as anything can be.

There is to me no halfway house—either God rules the world, in which case He rules you and me, not directly by special revelations, but indirectly by His mighty laws, which we can obey if we will; or He does not, in which case let us get married to-morrow, draw out of my banker's all the money I can find, go abroad, live happily till the money is spent, and then choke ourselves with charcoal. . . . I am not in favour of milk-and-water heresies, let us have strong ones, if any; I hate feebleness' (i, 110-112).

That is a noble and a stern philosophy of life, even though it may shock the reason of some and sear the soul of others. It rises to a higher level in another passage, which is perhaps the most self-revealing that Creighton ever wrote:—

'I am amused at —'s remark about the easy life I have led. If I were to write an autobiography, the reader would hardly say so. My life seems easy now because my main lines are clear, because I know what I mean. There is a magnificent passage in Dante, in canto xxvii of the "Purgatorio," at the end, where Virgil bids adieu to Dante and gives his final charges. Virgil (symbolising man's reason), sent by Beatrice (i.e. enlightened by God's grace), has led Dante through the Inferno (has shown him the exceeding sinfulness of sin), through the Purgatorio (has shown him the way of repentance and self-purification), and now, at the entrance of the Earthly Paradise, bids him go on his way in all peace and confidence. Read and meditate the whole passage; it is not an instruction to Dante for his behaviour in the Heavenly Paradise, but the Earthly, it is the rule of the good man's happiness here. I ponder over its grandeur and sublimity and wonder if it can be true.

"Thy will henceforth is upright, free, and sound;
To slight its impulse were a sin—then be
Lord of thyself, be mitred, and be crowned."*

It was his intensely moral nature then, and the imperative need for its full development and satisfaction, that impelled Creighton to undertake the pastoral office. It is true that his fellowship at Merton was one to which

* Life, I, 115. In the original:

'Libero, dritto, e sano è tuo arbitrio,
E fallo fora non fare a suo senno;
Perch' io te sopra te corono e mitrio.'

the obligation of taking orders was attached. But he accepted it because he intended to take orders; he did not take orders for the purpose of retaining it. Of that he was absolutely incapable, although the intellectual temper of Oxford was so little tolerant at the time of clerical fellowships and clerical fellows that many were fain to believe it was exactly what he did. He told his wife, shortly after their engagement, that it was the habit in Oxford to assume that a man who took orders must be either a fool or a knave, and that, as people could not call him a fool, they had concluded that he must be a knave. 'But,' she adds 'he never then or at any subsequent time troubled to explain himself; he went his way and lived his life, and left that to speak for him.' It did speak for him to those who knew its language; and, now that he is gone, it speaks for him more powerfully and more clearly than ever. Not that he exalted or coveted the pastoral office as such. He would have been content, and, had he had his own way, he would perhaps have chosen, to remain a college tutor until his pre-eminent intellectual gifts had seated him in some professorial chair. But the Christian ministry was the natural expression of his moral nature and aspirations.

It has been said that he coveted influence. On a former occasion we quoted the opinion of an old friend to this effect. 'Nothing came up so often as a pet idea of his about "influence."' The fidelity of the record is not to be disputed, but it would seem to apply only to an early and passing phase of Creighton's intellectual and moral development. There is his 'pastoral,' no doubt, but it seems to us to imply, not so much a craving for influence at large, as the conscientious discharge of what he regarded as a specific moral obligation.

It is very significant in this regard that during his school days he accidentally discovered that he had considerable powers as a mesmerist. For the amusement of his school-fellows he practised these powers for a time, but recognising the danger of the gift he soon refrained from its exercise altogether and never employed it again. It would seem that in after years he abandoned in like manner, and perhaps for the same reason, that 'pet idea of his about influence,' of which his old college friend spoke. He had been a decided High-churchman in his under-

graduate days, but, as a fellow and tutor of his college, 'he no longer retained the extreme High Church views which he had held as an undergraduate.' With the casting off of these views there probably sloughed away from him at the same time, never to reappear, every trace of that undue hankering after influence which is a familiar note of the sacerdotal temper.

Certainly in his maturer years no man was less covetous of influence in this sense than he was. It was utterly opposed to his passionate respect for the inalienable freedom of the individual soul. He writes in 1871:—

'I have seen that one can really do no good by interference, that everybody must fight out his own battles. All one can do is to watch the conflict and be ready to cheer the combatant when weary. . . . Each person's character must be formed by his conflict and by that only. I twaddle on, for I feel my conflict is in its main battle over: my character is made, such as it is. I have not now the daily hand-to-hand fight, merely the skirmishing on the outposts. . . . I seem to know what the whole thing means' (i, 116).

That is not the temper of a man who wants to help others by influence to avoid the conflict which has been his own salvation and must be theirs. Ever 'ready to cheer the combatant when weary,' he will, if duty bids or affection calls, help him to fight his battle to a finish; but he will not help him to avoid it. 'It's no good saying to the panting, struggling creature, "How hard it is for you to have to fight the battle."' Sacerdotal influence is as utterly alien to a man in this mood as any other of the arts of the Jesuit. It is the mood of a man, of a true soldier of the Master he had found and acknowledged, not of a server of tables.

We have spoken of Mrs Creighton's courage and candour in giving to the world so many extracts from Creighton's letters written to herself during their engagement. There is much more to be said about the letters themselves. They are by no means love-letters in the ordinary acceptance of the term. Very likely there was plenty of love-making in them as originally written; but, if so, Mrs Creighton, as was only to be expected, has wisely suppressed all that. What she has left is a human document of quite capital importance and quite universal

interest, a very touchstone, to those who read ever so little between the lines, of spiritual insight and ethical penetration, the inner history of a soul and its conflicts, heightened in its expression and strengthened in its outcome by the sanctifying and redeeming influence of a pure and perfect love. Nothing but that could have drawn forth these 'immense confessions'—the phrase is his own—from a nature so reserved as his. 'It does not do,' he writes in one letter, 'to have the human soul upon the dissecting board always or even often.' For this reason he regards Rousseau's 'Confessions' as 'the most loathsome book he ever read.' But 'love is enough,' and so he found it, enough to lay bare the deepest springs of his being, but still to the eyes of love alone. That indeed is what differentiates these confessions, as we have called them, from all other confessions with which it might be tempting to compare them. There is no sort of posing in them. They were not written for publication.

We have seen, though only, perhaps, as in a glass darkly, what was the nature of the conflict. We know from his own words (i, 110) that it was love that completed the victory.

'You know I believe in a period in the development of character when the mind turns from unrest to rest. I am becoming dimly conscious of the immense influence you have had upon me in that way. I was struggling blindly in that direction, striving to attain an absolute self instead of a phenomenal one, quite conscious of the necessity of doing so, and trying to bridge over my conscious defect by cultivating a habit of self-assertion which you recognised in me when you first saw me, and so I was an enigma to those around me and was regarded as a "talker of paradoxes." In you all things have become new. I have emerged out of that. In all chief matters I more clearly see what I am, what I can do.'

Thus there were two stages in the making of Creighton's soul. The first was the period of unrest and conflict, of the 'transition from traditional to rational beliefs,' when he became an enigma to himself and others. This was followed by victory and the recovery of tranquillity. 'I feel my conflict in its main battle is over, my character is made, such as it is. . . . A reinforcement from you enabled me to win a decisive victory.' From the date of that victory Creighton's character was fixed and

his soul was made. There was no further organic change, though there was unceasing growth of the permanent self in the soil fertilised by his travail. He had found, once for all, the truth which responded to his spiritual needs; and the truth had made him free.

‘Libero, dritto, e sano è tuo arbitrio,
E fallo fora non fare a suo senno.’

But it was not in Dante that he found the peace that he sought. It was Goethe that gave him the clue which finally led to his deliverance. That clue was *Entsagung*, as Creighton understood and interpreted it.

‘It is a word’ (he says) ‘which I dare say Goethe uses only casually, if at all, and which Lewes uses to denote briefly a general point of view. The word merely means, I apprehend, “renunciation,” and is merely a right way of regarding that which everybody has practically to regard, phrase it as he will, the fact that we cannot in life get everything we want, that our ideal is considerably higher than what we really attain.’*

That is what he got from Goethe; but he made a great deal more of it for himself. He developed it, we will not say into a complete philosophy of life, but into a large regulative principle which enabled him to realise his permanent if not his absolute self.

‘I wish you would study Goethe more and grasp his doctrine of *Entsagung*, the doctrine that morality consists in the consciousness of self, and that freedom and content are to be obtained only by the recognition of one’s limits, and by self-identification with them; so that what first appears as an iron barrier set before us by remorseless destiny is, by the mere process of its moral recognition, transformed into an internal precept for our moral guidance, becomes a help rather than a hindrance, for it makes life more definite and its problem more soluble’ (i, 106).

It is a hard saying, no doubt, and to many, perhaps, it will seem unsatisfying, inadequate, even contradictory.

* Life, i, 108, 109. It is all implicit, perhaps, in the concluding lines of Goethe’s sonnet, ‘Natur und Kunst’ :—

‘Wer Grosses will, muss sich zusammenraffen :
In der Beschränkung zeigt sich erst der Meister
Und das Gesetz nur kann uns Freiheit geben.’

Yet perchance Browning meant the same thing when he wrote—

‘Love, we are in God’s hand.

How strange now looks the life He makes us lead!

So free we seem, so fettered fast we are!

I feel He laid the fetter: let it lie!’

Creighton, as we have said, approached the speculative problem through the portal of the moral sense. His passion for right doing compelled his intellect to find some other solution than Kant—according to Heine—found in the deliverance of pure reason.

‘Immanuel Kant hat bis hier den unerbittlichen Philosophen trazirt, er hat den Himmel gestürmt, er hat die ganze Besatzung über die Klinge springen lassen, der Oberherr der Welt schwimmt unbewiesen in seinem Blute, es giebt jetzt keine Allbarmherzigkeit mehr, keine Vatergüte, keine jenseitige Belohnung für diesseitige Enthaltensamkeit, die Unsterblichkeit der Seele liegt in den letzten Zügen—das röchelt, das stöhnt.’

Creighton sought it, and found it, as he believed, in the doctrine of *Entsagung*, which, he says, is merely

‘the application of the doctrine of law to morals. . . . A man obeys the laws of nature instinctively, and the laws of society without effort, except against very violent passions. *Entsagung* is merely the name for the process by which he realises, with equal vividness, and obeys with equally little effort, the law of his own nature, which he can only discover for himself. Many people don’t discover it. But surely, if morality is to be possible, it must be grasped and obeyed, and one’s impulses for the moment subordinated to the higher law of one’s whole nature.) In separate things one is impelled by one part of one’s nature. Morality enforces the subjection of that part to the whole, and *Entsagung* merely points out that obedience ought not to take the form of submission to an abstract external criterion of duty, as something apart from us and outside us, but rather ought to be a joyful resignation of one’s partial self to one’s universal self; the limit is that set by calm knowledge to momentary caprice. According to that notion, self-sacrifice vanishes, all limits are recognised as self-imposed, are merely the utterance of one’s entire self against one’s partial self; hence there is pleasure in the most disagreeable duty, for the act performed is not regarded from its accidental accompaniments, but from its real bearing on one’s permanent self. Meditate, and you will see my exposition is sound; it

is the only basis of rational as opposed to emotional morality; it involves the difference between content and discontent; it makes man absolute master of circumstances, for they cannot affect his moral being in itself, but merely its momentary form to others' (i, 107, 108).

That, then, is the solution from the purely ethical point of view. How it appears in its religious aspect we learn from an earlier letter.

'Utilitarian morals pure and simple would always tend to degenerate unless perpetual reference were kept up to their main principle; and it is because that principle is so abstract that the process of rectification is difficult to carry on at the same time as action. . . . But the advantage of the religious standard is that, not being purely intellectual, but largely emotional, it can continually be repaired and heightened unconsciously and without effort; moreover, it can always go on assimilating to itself new conditions and relationships of life, as the emotions act so much quicker than the reason. Hence, too, arise the doubts which it begets: on the one hand, intellectual processes seem from time to time to clash with what one's emotions are engaged in preserving, and we all of us have struggles to co-ordinate our intellectual results with our emotional standard. . . . Similarly, from the side of the emotions, a new and strong feeling introduced into life at first takes possession of it, seems to be a motive strong enough in itself for everything; presently, in practice, it is not found to be so, and then disappointment ensues, and the feeling of disappointment is construed as being a just judgment for the abandonment of the calmness and repose which a belief in God alone can give. . . . Here again the duty of a true man is, I think, to try and co-ordinate the two emotions, to see in the one a reflex of the other, to borrow for the human love that permanence which can only properly belong to the divine by merging unconsciously the two—to add to the divine that intensity which can only come from definiteness of view; so an entire knowledge of any human soul can add to one's clearness of the abstract yet concrete perfection of humanity exhibited in Christ, and through that, to see more clearly the godlike embodied in every man, which can only be seen and grasped through reading every man in the light of Christ' (i, 95, 96).

In this manner then, and with the aid of *Entsagung*, Creighton effected for himself a synthesis between the

moral sense and the religious consciousness. Religion was for him, as it was for Matthew Arnold, 'morality touched with emotion'; but it was also a great deal more. It was a definite dogmatic faith, of which the underlying facts were not only certified *ab extra*, as he would have required any other historical facts to be certified, but were branded into his being by their essential identity with the categorical imperative of moral duty. That the underlying facts were adequately certified he probably never doubted. But he was not perhaps greatly concerned with the historical proofs of Christianity. He found its best credentials in the travail his soul had undergone. He was not unacquainted with modern criticism; but he would have disputed its title to establish a negative conclusion against the overwhelming evidence of the correspondence of the moral order with what all Christians understand by 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost.' To doubt the Christian faith was, for him, to make conscience a liar.

We have quoted largely from these letters, in order to make it clear that we are putting no private interpretation of our own on Creighton's views and beliefs, but are merely bringing out and putting together the one revelation of his inner self that Creighton ever made to any human being. The letters are not a formal confession of faith, nor are they to be criticised as a public *apologia* or history of his religious opinions. We can only take them in the spirit in which Mrs Creighton has given them. 'They were written,' she says, 'for the eye of one person only, and at a time when a man is likely to reveal himself with absolute frankness, because he is sure of understanding sympathy.'

In the light of these confessions, then, we must henceforth regard Creighton's life. If he truly read himself he need no longer be an enigma to others. There was always, deep down in his nature, the solid rock of truth and conviction on which his being was immutably fixed. Nevertheless it is certain that he retained to the last what many people thought was a love of sheer paradox, but what was in reality his intense delight in the free play of talk, his profound belief in its value as an intellectual *katharsis* and an antidote to social banality. As Aristotle

held that tragedy affords a relief from the emotions to which it appeals, so he held that the free play of talk tended more than anything else to clarify and disengage ideas with which the mind might otherwise be confused and oppressed.

'A timely utterance gave that thought relief,
And I again am strong,'

might well be the device with which he entered into the lists of conversation.

'I try more habitually perhaps than most people to apply an intellectual standard to most things . . . but I hold most strongly and feel most strongly that every idea one has ought to be not so much useless mental furniture, but rather the very rod and staff of one's life and conversation. Let us have ideas, whether they are right or wrong; let us say what we think, toss out our crude opinions for criticism and destruction, refrain from nothing for fear of being thought foolish or extravagant or disreputable; if it is genuine thought, it is worth uttering, not dogmatically, but through a desire to give it form and to have it criticised, examined, tested. I think that is as near an explanation of my point of view as I can give. Tell — that my bark is worse than my bite; that I don't really know anything, but am struggling to discover; that there is nothing I court more than difference and discussion; that I am most desirous of learning, and that I am perfectly conscious that my experience has been very small, and so am most desirous to hear always the results of others' (i, 97).

No doubt in after years he sometimes used conversation as a cloak, as he avowedly did during his *Wanderjahre*, his period of conflict; but he much more often used it, as Socrates did his dialectic, as an agency for bringing ideas to the light and displaying them from all points of view, and he always enjoyed it intensely (as Canon Scott Holland has remarked) as a game, playing it with a skill in which he had few equals. For this reason, and also because he never could bridle his sense of humour, some people thought him wanting in seriousness. It was just because he was at bottom so serious, that he knew so well 'desipere in loco.' How serious, and yet how wise and tender he was, never inviting confidence and never repelling it in those who were entitled to give it or to ask it, let any of those say who ever had to consult him

seriously. Then the real man came out, the heart as large as humanity, the intellect as clear as crystal, the judgment unerring. He used few words, perhaps, but, however little he said, he left nothing essential unsaid. He was not infallible, of course; but those who consulted him in this way seldom repented them of his counsel.

When the clue supplied by the disclosure of Creighton's ultimate beliefs is once firmly grasped, the reader of his biography will find no more riddles to be solved in his character and career. Rare intellectual power, combined with a moral steadfastness perhaps even rarer, was his *differentia*. Yet his intellect, capacious and catholic as it was, was essentially practical rather than speculative. In conjunction with his untiring industry and his inexhaustible sympathy with all things human, it made him a great historian; but it also made him a consummate man of action. It is easy to say, and not very difficult to think, that he ought to have remained a student and a historian, and never to have become a bishop. That is perhaps a right thing to say of Bishop Stubbs, but it is, in our judgment, a shallow thing to say of Creighton. From first to last what impressed those who knew him best was not so much his commanding intellectual powers as his rare genius for affairs. The evidence of this is abundant throughout the biography. Mrs Holden, the wife of his headmaster, 'remembers prophesying his future, and assuring him that he would some day be a bishop.' Elected to a fellowship at Merton and appointed to a tutorship, he very speedily became the leading spirit of the college. Even before that the present Master of Balliol (who had been his tutor) said of him, 'Creighton possesses common-sense in a degree which amounts to genius.' He took no very active part in university affairs; but, when the question arose whether he should stay in Oxford or go to Embleton, those who were for persuading him to stay were thinking more of his qualifications for academical leadership than of his opportunities for academical study; and, when one of his brother fellows heard of his decision to go, he said, 'Then you will end by being Archbishop of Canterbury.'

At Embleton it is probable that his happiest years were spent, and Mrs Creighton's picture of his life there is an idyll of singular charm. There, at any rate, he

seemed to combine in the happiest fashion the studious and the active life. It was there that his great work on the Papacy was conceived and, in large measure, executed; at any rate, the foundations of the whole structure were laid there. But, if his intellect was in his books, his heart was in his parish; and long before he left Embleton his neighbours in Northumberland had discovered that he had few equals among them in his shrewd grasp and wise handling of affairs. They were humble affairs for the most part—parochial, local, provincial at the best. But Creighton did not measure things by this scale. He was thought to be ambitious, but, in truth, he was not. He had no ambition beyond the faithful discharge of 'the trivial round, the common task.' When promotion and great station came to him he took them, but he never sought them. What he found to do he did, neither seeking it nor avoiding it.

'To me life has always been a simple matter, and has consisted in doing the duties which lay to my hand as well as I could. I have never been so presumptuous as to suppose that I was pre-eminently fitted for some duties, and could therefore absolve myself from others. I have been a tutor, a parish priest, a professor, a canon—none of these things by my own choice.'

When, 'by no wish or seeking' of his own, he was called to other duties, he obeyed the call, not because he liked it, still less because it appealed to his ambition, but because it appealed to his sense of duty, to 'the only ideal I had ever had of life—to go about and try and help others, with kindness and sympathy.'

That is why he accepted a bishopric when it was offered him, not at all because it gave him worldly distinction or widened his sphere of activity. Neither motive swayed him in the least. The smallest sphere was wide enough for him. The largest was not too wide. By no wish or seeking of his own he was promoted to the companionship of sovereigns and ministers of state, of all that is most exalted among men. He took it all as it came, neither losing himself nor magnifying his office, but in exactly the same spirit—the spirit of fellowship and helpfulness—in which he had taken the companionship of fisher-folk and quarrymen, of his parishioners

one and all, from the retired statesman to the humblest hind on the farm. One motive ran through it all, the abiding conviction that a man 'cannot refuse the responsibilities of his branch of the service,' even though a bishopric may be to him 'personally, after the flesh, a terrible nuisance.' That is surely the note of a man of action of the highest type, of a man who knows no higher ambition, and will acknowledge no lower duty, than that of spending himself and being spent in the service of man, which is to him also the truest service of God.

We do not doubt, on the other hand, that his own personal inclination would have been for the life of a student, though even here his practical bent comes out in the choice of his particular line of study. 'His deep interest in character,' says Mrs Creighton, 'was both the cause and the effect of his historical studies.' We should rather put it that his interest in character, quickened by the conflict in which his own character had been formed, drew him to the study of history; and the study of history deepened, in its turn, his insight into character. But it was a practical motive that actuated him, a moral rather than a purely intellectual impulse. Mrs Creighton says that 'any one who watched him closely day by day could not fail to see that his first love was the life of the student. . . . In leaving Embleton he deliberately chose the life of a student.' That is so, no doubt; but his choice, as we know, did not determine the issue. To Cambridge was added Worcester, where his native aptitude for affairs quickly made him the leading spirit of the Chapter; and even Cambridge was soon to learn that, great as was his influence on the studies associated with his chair, his sagacity in counsel was not less conspicuous than his love of study and his power of inspiring that love in others.

In fact, Creighton was a man whose personal inclination did not always coincide with the native bent of his genius. We may grant his personal inclination for study, but we must also recognise his consummate gift for affairs; and, according to his own philosophy, if a man is true to himself it is always the best part of himself that ultimately finds expression in his life. If that is so, he was born to be a man of action, but a man of action

who derived his best inspirations from his knowledge of human history and his insight into human character. Dr Hodgkin, a student and historian himself, was right when he said:—

‘I have sometimes doubted whether, with all his great literary talent, his heart was really in literature. It seemed to me that human affairs, moulding the lives of others and organising a parish or a diocese, was work which he really enjoyed more than writing a book. In other words, that he was essentially not a student but a “shepherd of the people”’ (ii, 489).

We may illustrate and confirm this view by considering two critical episodes of his life—one showing how he stood as a man of letters, a writer and interpreter of history, the other how he stood as a man of affairs when, as Bishop of London, he had to grapple with the problem of the lawlessness of some of his clergy. In the one case the man of action within him mitigated and controlled his judgment as a moralist and a student of history; in the other, the student of history within him gave to his handling of a grave practical problem a breadth and sobriety of judgment, a spirit of charity, forbearance, and sweet reasonableness, such as rarely prevail, and are still more rarely appreciated in times of excitement. When the second instalment of his great work on the Papacy was published, it was, at his request, reviewed by Lord Acton in the ‘English Historical Review,’ of which Creighton was editor. He was perplexed, and yet not a little amused at his critic’s lofty tone of censure. Lord Acton wrote from the point of view with which readers of his letters to Mrs Drew are now familiar—that of the historian whose standard of morality is absolute and who will not admit extenuating circumstances in his verdict on evildoers in high places. But what he wrote was so obscure that Creighton asked for a more definite exposition of the philosophy of history involved in its bearing on the points at issue between them, the chief of which was the exact degree of moral censure to be passed on persecution and persecutors. He received a long reply, of which the pith is perhaps contained in the following sentences:—

‘You say that people in authority are not to be snubbed or sneered at from our pinnacle of conscious rectitude. . . . I

cannot accept your canon that we are to judge Pope and King unlike other men, with a favoured presumption that they did no wrong. If there is any presumption, it is the other way—against holders of power—increasing as the power increases. . . . Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men, even when they exercise influence and not authority; still more when you superadd the tendency or the certainty of corruption by authority. . . . The inflexible integrity of the moral code is to me the secret of the authority, the dignity, the utility of history. If we may debase the currency for the sake of genius, or success, or reputation, we may debase it for the sake of a man's influence, of his religion, of his party, of the good cause which prospers by his credit and suffers by his disgrace. Then history ceases to be a science, an arbiter of controversy, a guide of the wanderer . . . it serves where it ought to reign, and it serves the worst cause better than the purest' (i, 371, 372).

Creighton's rejoinder is very characteristic.

'It is a rare encouragement to me to have such a standard set up as you have put before me. Judged by it I have nothing to say except to submit "*efficaci do manus scientiæ*." . . . You conceive of History as an architectonic for the writing of which a man needs the severest and largest of training, and it is impossible not to agree with you: so it ought to be. I can only admit that I fall far short of the equipment necessary for the task that I have undertaken. . . . I entirely agree with your principles of historical judgment; but apparently I admit casuistry to a larger extent than you approve. . . . What I meant in my offending sentence in my preface was, that any one engaged in great affairs occupied a representative position, which required special consideration. . . . The acts of men in power are determined by the effective force behind them of which they are the exponents. Their morality is almost always lower than the morality of the mass of men; but there is generally a point fixed below which they cannot sink with impunity. . . . You judge the whole question of persecution more rigorously than I do. Society is an organism, and its laws are an expression of the conditions which it considers necessary for its own preservation. . . . Nowadays people are not agreed about what heresy is; they do not think it a menace to society, hence they do not ask for its punishment; but the men who conscientiously thought heresy a crime may be accused of an intellectual mistake, not necessarily of a moral crime. . . . I am hopelessly

tempted to admit degrees of criminality, otherwise history becomes a dreary record of wickedness. I go so far with you that it supplies me with few heroes, and records few good actions. . . . I can rarely follow the actions of contemporary statesmen with much moral satisfaction. In the past I find myself regarding them with pity. Who am I that I should condemn them? Surely they knew not what they did' (i, 372-5).

'The captain of the Hampshire grenadiers,' wrote Gibbon, 'has not been useless to the historian of the Roman Empire.' The vicar of Embleton was assuredly far from useless to the historian of the Papacy.

We have seen how the man of action regards the study of history. Let us now see how the historian comports himself in the conduct of affairs. It is convenient for the purpose of analysis thus to distinguish between the two aspects of Creighton's personality; but, of course, in the concrete, they were inseparable. Creighton's handling of the ritualistic controversy in his diocese gave at the time little satisfaction to either or any party. The truth is it was not a party handling at all. It was merely a wise, temperate, and tolerant assertion of the historic position and attributes of the Anglican Church. Of course he seemed to be trifling with a great issue when he advised Mr Kensit to attend a church in which the services suited him rather than a church in which they did not suit him. But surely the advice was sound, pertinent, and unanswerable. It would have been irrelevant and impertinent if Mr Kensit had been a resident in a remote country parish where he must attend his parish church or none. But seeing that he went to St Ethelburga's with a merely colourable qualification as a parishioner, solely for the purpose of protesting against the services in vogue there, the Bishop's advice was nothing but an epigrammatic exposure of the essential weakness of Mr Kensit's position. It neither approved nor condoned the ritualistic vagaries of the incumbent of St Ethelburga's. Those were dealt with on their merits, and not ineffectually in the end. But it did put a wrong-headed man in a thoroughly false position; and that was what it was meant to do. It was, as Dr Cobb says, 'the advice of the statesman, and received a prophet's reward.' Not less characteristic of the

statesman was his final answer to Sir William Harcourt. We all know what was Sir William's attitude towards ritualistic excesses. It was that of the man in the street presented by a great advocate and a great parliamentary debater. It was not that of the historian nor that of the true statesman, as Creighton's letter shows.

'I can only express my own opinion, that there is no way of combating error except by setting forth truth. . . . It is quite necessary that men should obey the law, that they should be subject to authority. If men, who say that they are trying to do good, and claim to act through conscientious motives, refuse to do these things, such refusal has wrought great results in the world's history. It has never been overcome by force, or by the application of law. There has never yet been a case in history of an attempt to overcome it by reason, by investigation, by discussion, by definition, by gradual isolation of eccentricity from grains of partial truth. Yet I am foolish enough to believe that this is the only possible method. I should have thought that at least it was innocuous. The talk of a few pedants in a corner could not affect the mighty stream of indignation which swells the English breast, and will work its will through that means which is called *political*. You abuse me for what I do as well as for what I do not do. Your way is the popular way; why not leave mine to do what it may? You will say, "No appearance of truce with law-breakers." But do not we want to find why seemingly good men break the law? The plea of law-breaking was used against Wyclif, Huss, Luther, everybody whom we now call reformers. Of course there is no parallel between them and Lord Halifax. Yet I cannot apply to Lord Halifax a kind of treatment which, *mutatis mutandis*, I condemn in Leo X, in Archbishop Courtenay, in the Council of Constance. They all of them refused to discuss the thing in itself; they all upheld the law; they all secured the rapid downfall of the law, and of their method of upholding it. I know that you will regard all this as hopeless from a practical point of view. Nobody knows this better than I do. We are both of us idealists. I rank you with Lord Halifax. He is pursuing a revival of old methods of religious thought; you are for reviving the old means of persecuting him. I am so far modern that I do not believe in the vitality of his ideas, or in your mode of suppressing him. I want to drag him into the light and slay him in the open. My interest is more with the Church of the twentieth century than with that even of the sixteenth (ii, 449, 450).

Which is the better man of action here—the student or the politician? It was because Creighton was a man of action in the making that he had turned instinctively to the study of history; it was because he had studied history side by side with human nature in the concrete that, in the fullness of time, he stood forth among men of action as ‘the noblest Roman of them all’—the still, strong, patient man who knew what to do and how to do it, heeding neither the ‘*civium ardor prava jubentium*’ in ‘the bray of Exeter Hall,’ nor the ‘*vultus instantis tyranni*’ in the shape of Sir William Harcourt on the warpath. It was not granted to him to see the full fruit of his labours. But that is a small matter; and so he would have regarded it.

Here we must make an end. In what we have written we have had in view rather the appreciation of a personality than the record of a career. To understand Creighton the latter must be interpreted in the light of the former. That is why, in his lifetime, he was so often and so widely misunderstood. To the world the secrets of his spiritual life were not revealed. It seemed so easy to regard him as the man of brilliant parts, the intellectual gladiator, who could have attacked the Christian faith as readily, and with as little misgiving, as he defended it, and who only found his account in accepting it because to do so advanced his interests and ministered to his ambition. We have written to little purpose if we have not suggested a truer and a deeper solution than that.

Art. VII.—PEARLS AND PARASITES.

1. *Report to the Government of Ceylon on the Pearl-oyster Fisheries of the Gulf of Manaar.* By W. A. Herdman, F.R.S. Parts I and II. Published by the Royal Society. London, 1904.
2. *On the Origin of Pearls.* By H. Lyster Jameson. 'Proceedings of the Zool. Society of London,' 1902.
3. *Zoology.* By A. E. Shipley and E. W. MacBride. Cambridge: University Press, 1901. (Second edition, 1905.)

CERTAIN Eastern peoples believe that pearls are due to rain-drops falling into the oyster shells which conveniently gape to receive them.

'Precious the tear as that rain from the sky
Which turns into pearls as it falls on the sea,'

as the poet Moore writes. This belief is of ancient origin, and is probably derived from classical sources, since Pliny tells us that the view prevalent in his time was that pearls arise from certain secretions formed by the oyster around drops of rain which have somehow effected an entrance into the mantle cavity of the mollusc. Probably this theory of the origin of pearls has ceased to be held for many centuries, except in the East, where tradition has always been more influential than experiment. In the West it has long been known that pearls are formed as a pathological secretion of the mineral aragonite, combined with a certain amount of organic material, formed by the oyster or other mollusc around some foreign body, whose presence forms the irritant which stimulates the secretion. This secretion is of the same chemical and mineralogical nature as the 'mother-of-pearl' which gives the inside of the shell of so many molluscs a beautiful iridescent sheen.

An oyster shell consists of three layers, the outermost termed the *periostracum*, the middle the *prismatic layer*, and the innermost the *nacreous layer*. Everywhere the shell is lined by the mantle, consisting of a right and left fold or flap of the skin, which is in contact with the nacreous layer all over the inside of the shell. The edge of the mantle is thickened and forms a ridge or margin;

and it is this edge which secretes the two outer layers. This permits the shell to grow, whilst the rest of the mantle secretes all over its surface the nacreous or pearly layer. The relative thickness of these three layers varies very greatly. In the fresh-water mussel (*Unio*) the nacreous layer is many times thicker than the two outer layers put together; and such nacreous shells are usually associated with molluscs which are known to represent very ancient or ancestral species. It is also the layer which disappears most readily as the specimens become fossilised; and in fossil Mollusca it is often represented by mere casts, which fill the position it once occupied.

The fact that the nacre is deposited by the whole surface of the mantle has been appreciated by the Chinese. By inserting little flattened leaden images of Buddha between the mantle and the shell, and leaving the oyster at rest for some time, the image becomes coated with mother-of-pearl and incorporated in the substance of the shell; and in this way certain little joss figures are produced. This industry is said to support a large population in some coast districts of Siam.

The nacre, then, is produced by the outermost layer of the mantle or fleshy flap that lines the shell—the external epithelium; and, if a foreign body gets between this epithelium and the shell, the mantle will, in order to protect itself, secrete a pearly coat around it. But valuable pearls are not those which are partially or wholly fused with the shell, but those which lie deep in the tissues of the body; and they are probably formed in the following manner. The intrusive, irritant body forms a pit in the outer surface of the mantle; this pit deepens, and at first remains connected with the outside by a pore; ultimately the pore closes, and the bottom of the pit becomes separated as a small sac free from all connexion with the outside. The sac now sinks into the tissues of the oyster, enclosing in it the foreign body. It will be noticed that the inside of the sac is lined by and is derived from the same tissue or epithelium as covers the outside of the mantle. Now this epithelium continues to do what it has always been in the habit of doing; that is, it secretes a nacreous substance all round the intrusive particle. Layer after layer of this nacre is deposited, and thus a pearl is

formed. At first the layers will conform roughly to the outline of the embedded body, but later layers will smooth over any irregularities of the 'nucleus' around which they are deposited, and a spheroidal or spherical pearl is produced. If the irregularities are too pronounced, an irregular pearl is formed; and such pearls, on merely æsthetic grounds, command a lower price.

It is thus clear that pearls are formed around intrusive foreign bodies; and until comparatively recently these bodies were thought to be inorganic particles such as grains of sand. Recent research has, however, shown that this is seldom the case, and that as a rule the 'nucleus,' which must be present if a pearl is to be formed, is the larva of some highly-organised parasite whose life-history is certainly complicated but as yet is not accurately known. The knowledge, however, which we already possess enables us to do much to ensure steady success in a very speculative industry; and with complete knowledge there is no reason why pearl fisheries should not be under as good control as oyster fisheries.

It was more than forty years ago (1857-1859) that the problem of the Ceylon pearl-oyster fishery was first attacked in a thoroughly scientific spirit by a certain Dr Kelaart. His reports to the Government of the island contain the following suggestive sentences:—

'I shall merely mention here that Monsieur Humbert, a Swiss zoologist, has, by his own observations at the last pearl fishery, corroborated all I have stated about the ovaria or genital glands and their contents; and that he has discovered, in addition to the *Filaria* and *Circaria* (sic), three other parasitical worms infesting the viscera and other parts of the pearl oyster. We both agree that these worms play an important part in the formation of pearls; and it may be found possible to infect oysters in other beds with these worms and thus increase the quantity of these gems. The nucleus of an American pearl drawn by Möbius is nearly of the same form as the *Circaria* found in the pearl oysters of Ceylon. It will be curious to ascertain if the oysters in the inner banks have the same species of worms as those found in the oysters on the banks off Arripo.'

Unfortunately Dr Kelaart died shortly after making this report, leaving his investigations incomplete.

Some seven years before, in 1852, Filippi had shown that the pearls in our fresh-water mussel (*Anodonta*) were formed by the larvæ of a fluke (a trematode), to which he gave the name of *Distomum duplicatum*. Many students of elementary biology, as they painfully try to unravel the mystery of molluscan morphology, must have come across small pearls in the tissues of the fresh-water mussels (*Unio* or *Anodonta*); but these are said to have less lustre and to be more opaque than the sea pearl; so the pearl fisheries of the Welsh and Scotch rivers are falling into disuse. Our ancestors, however, thought otherwise. Less than fifty years ago the Scotch fisheries brought in some 12,000*l.* a year; and a writer of the early part of the eighteenth century describes Scotch pearls as 'finer, more hard and transparent than any Oriental.' British pearls were highly thought of by the Romans. Pliny and Tacitus mention them; and Julius Cæsar is said to have dedicated a breastplate ornamental with British pearls to Venus Genitrix. Fresh-water pearls are still 'fished' with profit in Central Europe; but the Governments of Bavaria, Saxony, and Bohemia watch over the industry and only grant a license to fish any stretch of water about once in twelve years—a restriction which, had it been imposed on our fisheries, might have saved a vanishing industry.

In 1871 Garner showed that the pearls in the edible mussel (*Mytilus edulis*), which is largely used for bait upon our coasts, were formed round the larvæ of a fluke, a remote ally of the liver-fluke that causes such loss to our sheep-breeders. This origin of pearls has been more completely followed out by Mr Lyster Jameson. Nor must we forget to mention the researches of Gial (1897) and Dubois (1901) in the same subject. We know the life-history of the organism forming pearls in the edible mussel far more completely than we do that of any other pearl-forming parasite; and, before returning to the Ceylon pearls, we will briefly consider it.

Mr Lyster Jameson finds that the pearls of the *Mytilus* are formed around the cercaria or larval form of a fluke which, in its adult stages, resides in the intestine of the scoter (*Edemia nigra*), and was originally described from the eider duck (*Somateria mollissima*) in Greenland and named *Leucithodendrium somateriae*, after its first know

host. The cercaria larvæ of these flukes form the last stage in a complex series of larval forms which occur in the life-history of a trematode or fluke, and they differ from the adult in two points—their generative organs are not fully developed, and they usually have a tail; but this organ is wanting in our pearl-forming cercaria, called a cercariæum by Mr Jameson. Such a larva has only to be swallowed by a scoter to grow up quickly into the adult trematode capable of laying eggs. Now this bird, called by the French fishermen the 'cane moulière,' is the greatest enemy to the mussel-beds; it is not only common around the French mussel-beds of Billiers (Morbihan), but occurs in numbers at the mouth of the Barrow channel, close to our English pearl-bearing mussel-beds. With its diving habits it destroys and eats large quantities of the mollusc. Those cercariæ which are already entombed in a pearl cannot, of course, grow up into adults, even if they gain entrance to the alimentary canal of the scoter; but those that are not ensheathed may do so. Further, the fluke may possibly live in other hosts where no pearl is formed. At any rate, there seems no lack of larvæ successful in their struggle to attain maturity, for it has been calculated that the alimentary canal of an apparently healthy scoter may harbour as many as six thousand adult flukes.

Thus there are two courses open to the cercaria when it has once found its way into the mussel; it either forms the nucleus of a pearl and perishes, or it is swallowed by a scoter, becomes adult, and prepares to carry on the race. But how do the cercariæ make their way into the mussel, and whence do they come? At present their birth, like that of Mr Yellowplush, is 'wrapped up in a mistry.' We may presume that the eggs make their way out of the scoter into the sea-water, and that there they hatch out a free-swimming larva, which, after the manner of trematodes, swims about looking for a suitable host. Within this host it would come to rest and begin budding off numerous secondary larvæ, in which stage it may assume considerable size and becomes known as a *sporocyst*. No one, however, has seen the eggs hatch, or the free-swimming larva; but Mr Jameson produces evidence to show that the sporocyst stage occurs in two other common molluscs, viz. in a clam (*Tapes decussatus*)

and in the common cockle (*Cardium edule*). The former mollusc abounds in the black gravelly clay which forms the bottom of the mussel-beds at Billiers; and every specimen out of nearly two hundred examples investigated by Mr Jameson was found to be infested with sporocysts containing larvæ closely resembling those which act as pearl-nuclei in the edible mussel. Exactly similar sporocysts were found in about fifty per cent. of the common cockles examined in the Barrow channel, where the species *Tapes decussatus* does not occur.

Within the sporocyst certain secondary larvæ are formed, as is habitual with the flukes. These secondary larvæ are the cercariæ; and it is in this stage that the animal makes its way into the pearl-mussel and ultimately forms the nucleus of a pearl. Precisely how it leaves the sporocyst and the first host, i.e. the *Tapes* or *Cardium*, is not known. Certain experiments made by Jameson, who placed mussels which he thought were free from parasites in a tank with some infected *Tapes*, are not quite conclusive, and have been ably criticised by Professor Herdman. It is true that, when examined later, the mussels were well infected; but it was not definitely shown that they were not infected at the start; and further, the numbers used were too small to justify a very positive conclusion. Still, on the whole, it may safely be said that the life-history of the organism which forms the pearls in *Mytilus edulis* probably involves three hosts: the scoter, which contains the mature form; the *Tapes* or *Cardium*, which contains the first larval stage; and the mussel, which contains the second larval stage, which forms the pearl.

Recently Professor Dubois has been investigating the origin of pearls in another species of *Mytilus* (*M. gallo-provincialis*) which lives on the French Mediterranean littoral. The nucleus of this pearl is also a trematode, but of a species different from that which infests the edible mussel. The interest of Professor Dubois' work, however, lies in the fact that he claims to have infected true oriental pearl-oysters by putting them to live with his Mediterranean mussels. He fetched his oysters, termed 'Pintadin,' from the Gulf of Gabes in southern Tunis, where they are almost pearl-less—one must open twelve to fifteen hundred of these to find a single pearl—

and brought them up amongst the mussels. After some time had elapsed they became so infected that three oysters opened consecutively yielded a couple of pearls each. These observations, however, require confirmation, and have been adversely criticised by Professor Giard.

To return to the Ceylon pearls. The celebrated fisheries lie to the north-west of the island, where the shallow plateaux of the Gulf of Manaar afford a fine breeding-place for the pearl-oyster. The pearl-oyster is not really an oyster, but an allied mollusc known as *Margaritifera vulgaris*. It lives on rocky bottoms known locally as paars. The fisheries are very ancient and have been worked for at least 2500, perhaps for 3000 years. Pliny mentions them, but he is, comparatively speaking, a modern. The Cingalese records go much farther back. In 550 B.C. we find King Vijaya sending his Indian father-in-law pearls of great price; and there are other early records. From the eighth to the eleventh century of our era the trade seems to have been chiefly in the hands of the Arabs and Persians; and many references to it occur in their literature. Marco Polo (1291) mentions the pearls of the kings of Ceylon; and in 1330 a friar, one Jordanus, describes 8000 boats as taking part in the fishery. Two centuries later, a Venetian trader named Cæsar Frederick crossed from India to the west coast of Ceylon to observe the fishery; and his description might almost serve for the present day, so little do habits alter in the East.

The records of the Dutch and English fisheries are naturally more complete than those of their predecessors. The last Dutch fishery was in 1768, and the first English was in 1796, before the fall of Colombo. The fishery is not held every year, but at irregular intervals; and sometimes these intervals have been long. For instance, the oysters failed between 1732 and 1746, and again between 1768 and 1796, under the Dutch régime, and from 1837 to 1854 under the English. On the other hand, the fishing is sometimes annual; recently, it took place with great success in 1887 and the four following years, culminating in the record year 1891, when the Government's share of the spoil amounted to close upon one million rupees. After this there was a pause till 1903.

The Lieutenant-governor, Mr Everard in Thurn, now

Governor of Fiji, has given a lively account of the latest fishing. He tells us that every year, in November, a government official visits the oyster-beds, takes up a certain number of oysters, examines them for pearls, and submits his results to certain government experts. If, as they did two years ago, these experts pronounce that there will be a fishing, this information is at once made known; and, partly by advertisement, but probably more by passing the word from man to man, the news rapidly spreads throughout India, up the Persian Gulf, and to Europe. In the meantime preparations on a large scale have to be made.

'On land, which is at the moment a desert, an elaborate set of temporary government buildings have to be erected for receiving and dealing with many millions of oysters and their valuable if minute contents. Court-houses, prisons, barracks, revenue offices, markets, residences for the officials, streets of houses and shops for perhaps thirty thousand inhabitants, and a water supply for drinking and bathing for these same people have to be arranged for. Lastly, but, in view of the dreadful possibility of the outbreak of plague and cholera, not least, there are elaborate hospitals to be provided.'

By March or April some hundreds of large fishing vessels have assembled at Manaar; and a population which varies during the next two months between 25,000 and 40,000 souls has gathered together.

The fishing-boats leave early in the morning for their respective stations; and, on reaching them, the Arab and Indian divers descend, staying under water from fifty to eighty seconds, and eagerly scooping up the oysters and depositing them in baskets slung round their necks. By midday the divers are worn out; and at noon a gun is fired from the master-attendant's vessel as a signal for return. The run home may take some hours, according to the distance and the wind; and it is during this time that a considerable number of pearls are said to be abstracted. The men on the boats are occupied with the sorting of the oysters and cleaning them of useless stones, seaweed, and other objects which are gathered with them. The finest pearls lie just within the shell, embedded in the edge of the mantle; and these readily slip out and are concealed about the person of the finder. The Govern-

ment does what it can to check speculation and keep a guard on each boat; but, in spite of all its efforts, there seems no doubt that many of the 'finest, roundest, and best-coloured pearls' pass into the possession of those who have no right to them.

On reaching the shore the oysters are carried to the Government building or 'Kottus,' a vast rectangular shed, where they are divided into three heaps; two of these fall to the Government, and the third belongs to the divers. This latter share the divers sell as soon as they quit the 'Kottus,' sometimes parting with dozens to one buyer, and sometimes selling as few as two or one. In the meantime the Government's two-thirds have been counted and are left for the night. At nine o'clock in the evening these oysters are put up to auction. The Government agent states how many oysters there are to dispose of, and then sells them in lots of one thousand. Some rich syndicates will perhaps buy as many as 50,000 at prices which fluctuate unaccountably during the evening. Within a short time the price will inexplicably drop from thirty-five rupees to twenty-two rupees a thousand, and may then rise again as suddenly and inexplicably as it sank. Early in the morning each purchaser removes his shells to his own private shed, where for a week they are allowed to rot in old canoes and other vessels of water, and are then searched for pearls. For a couple of months this great traffic goes on, until the divers are thoroughly exhausted, and the camp melts away.

Owing to the continuous failure of the fishery for ten years from 1891, the Government determined to call in the aid of experts. In the spring of 1901 Professor Herdman of Liverpool was asked by the Colonial Office, then under the direction of Mr Chamberlain, to visit Ceylon and to report upon the state of the fishery. He reached Colombo early in 1902. He was fortunate in taking out an exceptionally well qualified assistant in Mr J. Hornell. After a thorough examination of the fishing-grounds, Professor Herdman reported to the Government of Ceylon as follows:—

'The oysters we met with seemed, on the whole, to be very healthy. There is no evidence of any epidemic or of much disease of any kind. A considerable number of parasites, both external and internal, both protozoan and ver-

mean, were met with; but that is not unusual in molluscs, and we do not regard it as affecting seriously the oyster population.

'Many of the larger oysters were reproducing actively. We found large quantities of minute "spat" in several places. We also found enormous quantities of young oysters a few months old on many of the paars. On the Periya paar the number of these probably amounted to over a hundred thousand million.

'A very large number of these young oysters never arrive at maturity. There are several causes for this. They have many natural enemies, some of which we have determined. Some are smothered in sand. Some grounds are much more suitable than others for feeding the young oysters, and so conducing to life and growth. Probably the majority are killed by overcrowding.

'They should therefore be thinned out and transplanted. This can be easily and speedily done, on a large scale, by dredging from a steamer at the proper time of the year, when the young oysters are at the best age for transplanting.

'Finally, there is no reason for any despondency in regard to the future of the pearl-oyster fisheries if they are treated scientifically. The adult oysters are plentiful on some of the paars, and seem for the most part healthy and vigorous; while young oysters in their first year, and masses of minute spat just deposited, are very abundant in many places.'

The chief causes of the failure of the fisheries, at any rate the chief causes which can be dealt with by man, are overcrowding and over-fishing. It might be supposed that these factors would counteract each other; but it must be remembered that they become effective at the two opposite poles of the oyster's existence, which is thought to cover five, six, or seven years. The overcrowding takes place when the oyster is quite young and hardly fixed on the submerged reefs, whilst the over-fishing takes place when the animal is fully matured and perhaps growing old. The fact that Professor Herdman and Mr Hornell conveyed the young oysters from Manaar in the north of the island by boat to Colombo and then on by train to Galle in the south, and there succeeded in rearing them, shows that there would be little difficulty in artificially rearing oysters in convenient localities and then transplanting them to such fishing-grounds as show danger of depletion. With regard to over-fishing, if the

grounds are under the charge of a trained zoologist there is no reason why this should go on.

When Professor Herdman was called in to advise the Government, he saw at once that it was the oyster that had failed in the last ten years, not the pearls within the oysters. Microscopic examination of thin sections made through decalcified pearls showed that they are almost in all cases deposited around a minute larva which seems almost certainly to be the larva of a cestode or tape-worm. These larvæ make their way into the oyster, and the irritation they set up induces the formation of the pearl, just as was the case with the cercaria-formed pearls of the mussel. Where do these larvæ come from? Unfortunately we cannot say. Older specimens of tape-worms belonging to the new species, *Tetrarhynchus unionifactor*, also live in the oyster; and it may be that, were a larva to escape entombment in a pearl, it would grow up into one of these. But even these never become mature in the oyster; to attain sexual maturity they must be swallowed by a second host. What is the second host of the pearl-forming cestode? This question also we cannot answer; and, until we can, we are not in a position to control the output of pearls. Possibly the parent of this larva lives in the file-fish (*Balistes*), which preys on oysters and is usually regarded as an enemy to the pearl fishery. *Balistes*, however, may be a friend in disguise. Possibly the organism has to pass through as many as three hosts, and may only become sexually mature when it reaches the interior of one of the large fish-eating rays or sharks. All this we want to know.

The discovery by Professor Herdman and Mr Hornell of the cestode larva as a real cause of pearl-formation received an interesting confirmation shortly after they had made it. Mons. G. Seurat, working independently at Rikitea on the island of Mangareva in the Gambier group, discovered a very similar larva in the local pearl-oyster around which pearls are formed; this larva, if we may judge from pictures, is almost certainly the same as the one from Ceylon. Professor Giard regards it as belonging to a tape-worm of the genus *Acrobothrium*; and, if he be right, then Professor Herdman's larva is an *Acrobothrium* too. We have so little knowledge of the early forms of cestodes that we cannot accept this attribution as

final. We may, however, hope for further information, for a French zoologist, M. Boutan, has started for the East to work at the problem; Mr Hornell is still at work in Ceylon; and Mr C. Crossland, who has had much experience in marine work in the tropics, has recently been appointed, at the request of the Soudan Government, to investigate the pearl-oyster beds of the Red Sea.

Last year it was again found possible to hold a fishery in Ceylon. It was held at a place called Marichikaddi, also on the north-west coast. In the course of thirty-eight days over 41,000,000 oysters were taken. The trade was very brisk; the prices paid were unprecedented. This year's fishery, which began on Feb. 18, promises to beat all records. On Feb. 22 the catch was nearly 4,500,000 oysters; and the Government's share for that day was 9000*l*. It is perhaps too soon to attribute this success to the efforts of Professor Herdman and Mr Hornell, the latter of whom, we understand, has been permanently retained as government biologist in Ceylon; but we have no doubt that, acting under their advice, the oyster-bed may be made a steady, in place of a most intermittent source of revenue. Besides their valuable work in solving this particular problem, Professor Herdman and his colleague have made a rich collection of marine animals, which are being examined by a number of specialists. The results of their labours are appearing in a handsome series of volumes published under the auspices of the Royal Society; and it is from the first of these that many of the facts contained in this article are derived. The memoirs included in the volumes contain many important additions to our knowledge; but no result is more interesting or more economically important than the confirmation of the fact that, as M. Dubois puts it, 'La plus belle perle n'est donc, en définitive, que le brillant sarcophage d'un ver.'

A. E. SHIPLEY.

Art. VIII.—OUR NEGLECTED MONUMENTS.

1. *Reports from Her Majesty's Representatives abroad as to the Statutory Provisions existing in Foreign Countries for the Preservation of Historical Buildings.* Accounts and Papers: Miscellaneous, No. 2, 1897. [C. 8443.]
2. *La Legislazione delle Belle Arti.* By Filippo Mariotti. Rome: Unione Cooperativa Editrice, 1892.
3. *Denkmalpflege.* By Freiherr von Helpert. Vienna: Braumüller, 1897.
4. *Die Denkmalpflege in Frankreich.* By Dr Paul Clemen. Berlin: Ernst und Sohn, 1898.
5. *L'Ami des Monuments et des Arts.* 'Revue Trimestrielle Illustrée.' Paris, 1887, etc.
6. *Die Denkmalpflege.* Zeitschrift herausgegeben von der Schriftleitung des 'Centralblattes der Bauverwaltung.' Berlin, 1899, etc.

THERE is a historical city in the north, once the border capital of two warring kingdoms, the stronghold aimed at in every attack, unique among the cities of the island in the position inherited from those stormy times, and till the other day a separate entity between England and Scotland, but not reckoned to either. This city possesses ancient monuments of singular value. It is enclosed in a complete circuit of fortifications, erected in the days of Queen Elizabeth, in a form of particular interest to students of military works; and there still exist remains of a far ampler *enceinte*, taking in a space half as large again as the Elizabethan walls, and larger than the existing town can fill to-day. This is the *enceinte* made when 'Edwardus Primus, Scotorum Malleus,' fortified Berwick-upon-Tweed with a fosse eighty feet wide, and built a wall of solid masonry behind it, bristling with towers. It is the *enceinte* of the later days, when the watchmen on these towers looked ever to the north and west for the gleam of spears over Halidon Hill, or the swift approach of wild riders on Caledonian ponies round the level strip along the coast. In most parts it has been merged in the later Elizabethan circumvallation; but fifty years ago a stretch of more than half a mile of it remained, with the ditch still fully marked and fragments of Plantagenet masonry at intervals along it. One tower,

rebuilt in Tudor times, has been called the Bell Tower, because the tocsin was said to be sounded from it at the alarm of a Scottish raid. This part of the circuit faced the side of danger and was fullest of all in historical associations. On the side towards the Tweed it joined the castle, also of Edwardian origin, in the hall of which the English Justinian gave judgment on the claimants to the Scottish Crown.

The site of the hall, which both Scot and English might well have united to honour, is now occupied by the platform and waiting-rooms of the North British railway station; and the castle has almost passed out of existence because the railway could not go a few yards out of the course its engineers had laid down for it. The portion of the Edwardian *enceinte* just referred to remained intact till about 1850, when the Town Council filled in and levelled part of it for a cattle-market. Another portion was recently destroyed to form a site for a primary school. One would have deemed the study of these surviving landmarks of the story of mediæval Berwick an essential part of the education of every Berwick child; but they now read it all up in code text-books, on a site prepared for educational purposes by the destruction of these very landmarks.

Early in 1904 the Town Council hammered down another fragment of Edwardian wall, filled up another section of the fosse, and built thereon a house, while they let on building-leases another ample section of the *enceinte*. Then at last a public-spirited citizen of Berwick lifted up a voice that for a long time seems to have been almost a solitary one. The Rev. James King, vicar of St Mary's, Berwick, wrote to all the papers, and to every person of influence that he could think of, from the sovereign downwards, and succeeded at last in rousing both official attention and that of the public to the outrageous act of vandalism which was in progress. The Town Council was bombarded with letters of protest in the journals, and remonstrances from antiquarian societies both local and national; questions were asked in the House of Commons, and semi-official pressure was applied through a tactful representative of the First Commissioner of Works. Public money, moreover, was actually proffered to make it easier for the town to do what it should

have been proud to accomplish as a duty owed to its own fair fame and historical repute.

The spirit in which the Town Council was pleased to receive these representations, and the further proceedings in the matter of the threatened *enceinte*, need not here be described; the matter has only been adduced as an object-lesson; and no object-lesson could display more effectively the attitude we adopt in this country in regard to historical monuments. There exists no real reason for the destruction of the Edwardian *enceinte* of Berwick. The proposal was only made because those responsible for the government of the town had no sense of the value of that part of the civic assets; and in this respect, it is to be feared, they only shared in the national laxity of thought about matters of the kind. Many other recent cases could be adduced to show how precarious is the existence of many monuments which are part of the history of the country, and for the loss of which future generations may call us to account.

The case of the walls and towers of Newcastle-upon-Tyne deserves attention. This city views with justifiable satisfaction its position as a northern metropolis of industry, but it is a source of pride equally legitimate that its civic annals start from Roman times, and that it has played its part at all the principal epochs of the national history. Its medieval fortifications are the lasting witnesses to its importance as a factor in that history; and the antiquary, Leland, stated that they exceeded in grandeur those of any city in Britain. A good portion of the *enceinte*, which is more than two miles round, is still in existence. Formerly the Corporation owned the walls and towers, and kept them in repair from the proceeds of an impost somewhat similar to the French *octroi*. Subsequently the powers and duties of the Corporation were passed over to the trading-guilds, the present representatives of which have power to sell, for their private advantage, these historical monuments of civic and even national interest and importance. Only the other day a proposal was made that the Corporation should buy from one of the guilds a tower, called the Plummer Tower, for the express purpose of demolishing it in favour of a certain improvement scheme, the need for which is by no means urgent. That private persons should be able to

sell, or themselves destroy, civic heirlooms of the kind is nothing short of a public scandal; and that the town authorities should even think of recovering their property in these monuments for any other purpose than that of preserving them for future generations, is almost as bad. Here again considerable activity has been shown by those interested in the safeguarding of our older monuments, and an influential deputation to the Town Council expressed views that it is hoped will ultimately result in a proper settlement of the whole question of the Newcastle walls and towers.

A case in which a still more valuable monument was not only threatened but actually destroyed occurred a few years ago at Peterborough. If there be any mediæval buildings in the country that should be preserved with especial jealousy, they are the old tithe-barns, of which several good specimens still survive. They have a more than national value as examples of the great hall of timber and stone work, single or aisled, that appears as an early type of human dwelling in Greek and Teutonic literature. How noble they are in their largeness and simplicity the reader may learn from the sentences describing a great barn, evidently that at Bradford-on-Avon in Mr Hardy's 'Far from the Madding Crowd' (cap. xxii).

'The vast porches at the sides, lofty enough to admit a waggon laden to its highest with corn in the sheaf, were spanned by heavy pointed arches of stone, broadly and boldly cut, whose very simplicity was the origin of a grandeur not apparent in erections where more ornament has been attempted. The dusky, filmed, chestnut roof, braced and tied in by huge collars, curves, and diagonals, was far nobler in design, because more wealthy in material, than nine-tenths of those in our modern churches. Along each side wall was a range of striding buttresses, throwing deep shadows on the spaces between them, which were perforated by lancet openings, combining in their proportions the precise requirements both of beauty and ventilation.'

A fine structure of this type existed in perfect preservation a few years ago in a part of the town of Peterborough that was being rapidly covered with streets of comparatively small houses. It was part of some property belonging to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The land about it was sold by the Commissioners for

building purposes in 1876; and with the land went the old tithe-barn, as if it had been some shed or outhouse accidentally left on the ground. While the structure remained the property of the Commissioners it was practically safe, because the Commissioners individually are men who would recognise its artistic and historical value, especially in connexion with the medieval economics of the Church; but it casts a sinister light on our neglect of ancient monuments that such an edifice should have been handed over with a plot of building-ground, without any safeguard or reservation to protect it from the spoiler. The result was that, about six years ago, the grand old structure was pulled to pieces for the trifling value of its materials, the timber, it is said, being found so hard that it did not repay the cost of working. The site is now bare ground whereon the plan of the building can still be traced, but it is in the midst of a crowded district where a large hall, which could have been turned to one of several modern purposes, would have been a most valuable possession for the people. On this ground, as well as upon the more weighty artistic and historical considerations, strenuous efforts were made to save the fabric; but these were private efforts, and, for reasons into which it would be useless to enter, they proved unavailing.

One other recent case of threatened destruction and of chivalrous defence may be briefly referred to. This is the case of the Whitgift Hospital at Croydon. Croydon is a very populous and rapidly extending borough, and possesses near its centre a well-preserved specimen of a characteristically English institution in the form of an Elizabethan hospital or charitable foundation, similar in type, though subsequent in date, to the well-known St Cross by Winchester, and the Cheetham College at Manchester. These institutions, which, like the Oxford and Cambridge colleges, exhibit monastic or canonical forms suited to modern requirements, often present great architectural beauty in the disposition and character of their buildings, and are, in any case, little oases where, perhaps, in the midst of the whirl of a busy town, there is still a 'haunt of ancient peace.' The value of these points of rest in our crowded centres of population, of these memorials of the past that keep piety alive in minds that might yield

wholly to the obsession of the present, is even now very great, and will certainly not grow less as time goes on. The late Archbishop Benson, speaking in Croydon about the Whitgift Hospital, prophesied that it would 'stand for ever as the affectionate pride of multitudes of citizens'; and yet the authors of a recent street improvement scheme contemplated with a light heart the practical destruction of the fabric. A protest was immediately made by a newly formed Croydon Antiquities Protection Committee; and so many other societies and individuals have joined in an appeal to the urban authorities that there is some hope the building may be preserved.

Many other examples might be given, but such multiplication is not needed to show the precarious tenure on which this country holds so many of its artistic and historical treasures. No public authority is invested with legal powers to intervene for their preservation. The townsmen of Berwick required formal permission from the Office of Woods and Forests before they could build on their Edwardian *enceinte*; and this permission, surely with some supineness, was more than once actually granted. The Croydon local authorities would need parliamentary powers for demolishing part of Whitgift's Hospital; but prospective injury to ancient monuments will not always prevent parliamentary powers being obtained. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners cannot greatly have cared what became of their Peterborough tithe-barn; and, when it passed out of their control, its fate was in private and irresponsible hands. The Newcastle urban councillors have no power over their own town walls and towers. In France, on the other hand, all the monuments in question would certainly have been 'classés,' that is to say, placed formally under the supervision of the State; and the very first articles of the French Historical Monuments Act of 1887 would have rendered the proposed and partly accomplished acts of destruction illegal. In Germany, Italy, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and almost every other European country they would have figured on inventories kept by state-appointed commissions, and enjoyed the supervision of a general or provincial inspector of monuments.

In this connexion it will be of interest to enquire into

the machinery that exists at home and abroad for safeguarding the memorials of the past, whether in the form of single monuments of outstanding importance, or of the older domestic or semi-public buildings which still preserve to so many European cities their historical interest and their picturesque charm. In this country we are almost devoid of the official and semi-official machinery which is in full and fruitful action abroad. We dispose, on the other hand, perhaps more freely than foreign nations, of a force that, though generally latent, may, on occasions such as those just noticed, be stimulated to effective action. This is the force of public opinion. Public opinion, however, is in its very nature an unorganised force, acting spasmodically upon stimulus supplied by some striking event, or by the initiative of individuals who can magnetise their fellows. Popular agitations arise spontaneously from time to time, like that against the proposal to run a tunnel under Princes Street, Edinburgh, or that for a railway traversing the Lake District; but, on the other hand, projects still more deleterious than these may be carried through without the public waking up till the harm has been done.

This being so, what is evidently required is some permanent agency representing the popular mind at its best and always kept in working order. Such permanent agencies of an official or semi-official kind must be established by the general sense of the community; but in their turn they influence popular thought. Official action, though it may be limited in scope, yet sets a certain stamp upon the work in hand which wholesomely impresses the public mind. The care of ancient monuments, which, to the untutored intelligence, seems at first the mere fad of a few enthusiasts, acquires in this way estimation and efficiency. Government may really not be able or willing to do much officially; but the fact that it acts at all gives a general trend to public opinion, and makes it easier for individuals or societies, working in harmony with the official agency, to bring influence to bear in particular instances.

It is necessary to put in a true light the operations of these official agencies, because in this country we are inclined to set public opinion on the one side and official agencies on the other, as representing two mutually

exclusive methods, and to boast that England relies on the free action of opinion, while the foreigner finds protection behind the State. The truth is that public opinion on the Continent, as among ourselves, is the ultimate arbiter of all these questions. The official agencies are, in fact, the creation of public opinion; and their action, to be really fruitful, must be sustained by the same force. No one, for example, can study foreign Monument Acts, or follow the reports of official conservators, without seeing how financial questions are constantly coming to the front. The only effective agency by which the law can protect a monument in private hands that is in danger of alteration or destruction, is by compulsory purchase of the property by the State. All recent Acts of the kind, with the single exception of our own Ancient Monuments Act of 1882, rely ultimately on this power of expropriation; but it can only be put into force when there is money at the command of the Minister of Public Works or of the Interior. These officials will only secure a substantial credit from their *Landtag* or *Chambre* or *Camera* if their fellow-members know that their own constituents are, on the whole, in favour of a generous expenditure for this national purpose. In other words, it is only in so far as these historic monuments at home or abroad are generally recognised as things worthy of preservation that effective efforts will be made to ensure their safety.

This fundamental fact is recognised to the full by the friends of ancient monuments abroad; and in all the active propaganda on the subject, of which Germany is now the scene, speakers and writers have insisted that the movement must carry the public with it or it will have no real staying-power. It is not the case that state machinery is expected on the Continent to do all the work required. Its value is recognised as a sort of crystallisation of public opinion; and it is in this aspect that we should do well to establish it among ourselves. How little the champions of the cause in Germany are bound to a mere doctrinaire worship of machinery may be seen in the following characteristic quotation from a useful brochure by Dr F. W. Bredt of Berlin on the 'Care of Monuments,' with especial reference to the present condition of the movement in Prussia.

'The care of monuments by legal means issues in a protection secured in special cases by statutory provisions; but there is a wide field of many-sided activity open to those who adopt the method of freedom. Free-will is the golden way along which, as has so often been pointed out, the care of monuments can be most effectively carried on. The two requisites here are instruction and good feeling; and the intelligent co-operation of these often leads to the most satisfactory results. The first thing is to enlighten and instruct the people as to the significance of their monuments. This can be done through popular articles in the daily journals, through free public lectures, through the formation of local societies, or through personal influence on individuals. In every place there must be at least one man who will make it an affair of conscience to interest his fellow-citizens in the past history of their district, to open their eyes that they may read this history in stones, and realise the importance of the preservation of the record. Care should, above all, be taken to bring up the young to take delight in the memorials of old time. It should be one of the duties of a teacher to take his pupils frequently to the sites of old buildings and into the museums. When this is not possible, illustrations and drawings should be used to bring the monuments before the eyes of the young and kindle in them feelings of interest and affection. . . .

'When now a monument is in danger, the power of compulsion under the law, where such exists, should only be adopted as a last resource, for it is of the utmost importance in the interests of the whole movement to avoid arousing any opposition on the part of the public. By tact and good feeling it will very often be found possible to get the proprietor in question to consider favourably the representations made to him. If a refusal come, we ought not to be at once put off by it. We must try to put ourselves in thought into the position of the proprietor, and look at the end we have in contemplation from another point of view. Often, very often, will patience and amiability win in the end a partial if not total success. If, however, at the last nothing remain but the method of compulsion, then the law can only be of avail in cases where the State or the municipality has at its disposal at the moment the necessary means for the indemnification of the owner. However ideal may be our aim in the care of monuments, its self-evident condition is the indemnification of the owner whose interest is involved; and, if there is no chance of coming to an agreement, the matter must be finally settled by the process of expropriation. The saving hand is

accordingly, as has been said, always, in the last resort, the "hand full of gold."

We must now ask in what consists this official machinery with which continental countries are so much more liberally supplied than our own. We have to consider, first, state-appointed commissions and inspectors; second, Monument Acts; and third, local building regulations passed by individual towns in the interest of the preservation of their characteristic features. Of commissions, the two most august are the 'Commission des Monuments Historiques' of France, and the 'Central-Commission für Erforschung und Erhaltung der Kunst- und historischen Denkmale' of the Austrian Empire. The first was appointed in 1837, the other in 1850; and to each is committed a general supervision of the historical and artistic monuments of the country it represents.

The Austrian Commission has for its function 'to excite the interest of the public in the study and maintenance of monuments, and to assist the efforts in this direction of learned societies and of experts, so that the different races of the Empire may take pride in preserving the memorials of their past.' There are twenty members, chosen for five years from among known experts in art, archæology, or history; and the service is an honorary one. The commissioners are supplied with eyes and hands by the ubiquity and watchfulness of their 'conservators,' a hundred and forty-six in number, distributed through a hundred and sixty-seven districts, into which the Empire has, for this purpose, been divided. Three hundred and forty-eight 'correspondents' complete the network of agencies, through the meshes of which few monuments should be able to slip. It is the duty of these conservators to keep in touch with local societies and individuals, and to influence public opinion everywhere in favour of safeguarding the memorials of the past. They draw up inventories of the treasures of their districts, and report in all questions of restoration and upkeep; and one of their functions is to study all projects for new railways, roads, and other public works, in view of any injury that these may threaten to public monuments.

The French 'Commission des Monuments Historiques'

is the council of state of the Minister of Public Instruction and of the Fine Arts, who is the executive officer in all proceedings relating to monuments. The number of members is now thirty, some of whom hold their positions *ex officio*, while others are nominated by the minister. Some of these nominated members are always men of affairs and Deputies, so that the Commission may be properly represented in the Chamber. Membership of the Commission is an honorary post, and is regarded as conferring distinction on the holder. Some of the most illustrious names of modern France are to be found upon its muster-roll. Lamartine's is there, and those of Montalembert and Victor Hugo, as well as the names of architects and antiquaries such as Viollet-le-Duc, Lenormant, du Sommerard, and Charles Blanc.

The appointment of the Commission in 1837 was the outcome of a movement of which Montalembert and Victor Hugo were the inspiring force, Guizot the official representative. Its primary duty was to draw up a list of monuments possessing, from the point of view of history or of art, a national interest. This introduced the principle of what the French call 'classement,' that is, the selection of a comparatively small number of monuments of outstanding value on which attention is to be concentrated. A monument placed in the list is said to be 'classé'; and the number of 'monuments classés' in an official edition of the list issued in 1889 is about 2200, of which 318 are prehistoric monuments in the form of dolmens or cromlechs. When once the list of monuments has been made up, the chief care of the Commission is to look to their safe preservation and proper repair, and if it see fit, restoration. In this it is served by its 'Inspectors-General of Historic Monuments,' salaried officers of whom three supervise architectural monuments. In the actual carrying out of any work of repair or renewal there is available a staff of skilled architects, forty in number, who possess the honourable and coveted title of 'architects attached to the Commission for Historic Monuments,' and are served in the practical part of their operations by an official staff of 'Inspectors of Works.'

In accordance with the centralised system of French administration, all this machinery is directed from the one centre, Paris—a method which results in certain defects

discussed by Dr Clemen in his interesting work on the 'Care of Monuments in France.' The whole principle of 'classement,' on which the French system is based, is open to criticism. It has the advantage that the favoured monument enrolled on the list acquires at once a high value in the public eye, and is a means for the education of the people in a proper sense of piety towards these evidences of the national greatness in the past. On the other side there is the drawback that a certain slur seems to be cast on all the works of old time which have not found a place on the list. A monument 'non-classé' may appear fair game for the spoiler.

In Italy and Germany, as contrasted with France, the care of monuments is decentralised. In Italy it is not in the hands of any single central body, but in those of ten provincial boards of supervision, the 'Uffizi Regionali per la Conservazione dei Monumenti,' who are aided in their work by inspectors residing in the various towns. The Uffizi have their own staff of architects, who carry out the operations decided on in respect of works in their districts. There is also a central commission for monuments and works of antiquity and art, forming a privy council for the Minister of Public Instruction at Rome; and this co-ordinates the work of the Uffizi Regionali.*

Germany is, by nature and history, a decentralised country. Here the old independence of the towns has left its mark on the whole administration of the country; and the monuments are not monuments of Germany so much as monuments of Cologne or Mayence, of Nuremberg, Rothenburg, or Hildesheim. Cities of this order do not care only for their cathedrals and for a few public buildings of world-wide repute, but value also their general physiognomy, as well as the picturesque aspect of the streets due to the survival of a considerable number of domestic buildings of a secondary rank. These would never find a place on any state inventory of strictly national treasures; and yet their importance, as elements in a general effect, is great enough to make their preservation a matter of the utmost moment. In view of

* The Italian Monument Act was passed in 1902; but the 'Regolamento,' or official code of rules for its administration, an extensive document of 418 articles, was only published in July 1904. It contains a full account of the Italian system.

this, many of the older German cities have issued building regulations, some of which will presently be noticed.

The care of monuments in all the German states is in the hands of official custodians or monument commissions, who are responsible to the Ministers of Public Instruction or of the Interior. In Prussia, a long series of royal edicts and ministerial circulars, from 1815 downwards, gives evidence of the attention paid to these matters by the Government. Since 1844 there has been a General Conservator; and in 1891 the important decentralising step was taken of appointing provincial commissions and conservators, of whom there are now fourteen. Dr Clemen, whose work on France has been already referred to, fills this post for the important Prussian province of the Rhineland. Bavaria, Würtemberg, Saxony, and the various Grand-Duchies, possess similar machinery, which has, in most cases, been in operation for a considerable period. One of the chief works on which these agencies are engaged is the preparation of detailed inventories of the artistic treasures of each district. Some of their publications are on a monumental scale; and it was reported in 1901 that, with the completion of sections then in hand, the whole number of volumes would soon amount to two hundred. The inventory of the Rhenish provinces, under the editorship of Dr Clemen, is being issued in a handy and inexpensive form, and is a typical publication of the kind. The inventory, in five volumes, of the old buildings and works of art in the towns and villages of Mecklenburg-Schwerin is singled out for special praise by a German antiquary familiar with this class of publication.

In regard to inventories, a distinction must be drawn between the schedules of comparatively few outstanding monuments, intended to form the basis of a 'classement,' and lists which are designed to embrace every building of historical or artistic interest in a region, the preservation of which would be of local, though perhaps not of national, importance. Such complete catalogues have been at least aimed at both in France and Italy; and all the regions of Germany, as we have just noted, are thus mapped out. The difference between a 'classement' schedule and such an extended list may be seen on reference to a 'Handbook of the Official Care of Ancient Monuments in Alsace-

Lorraine,' recently published by F. Wolff, the conservator for Alsace. This district was already in charge of the French Commission for Historical Monuments when it passed, in 1871, under Prussian laws. The list of the Commission embraces 175 'monuments classés'; but the full inventory of buildings and other objects worth preservation, now published by the German conservator, amounts to 3104.

The minor states of Europe exhibit a similar official interest in historical monuments. Greece has its 'Ephor-general' of antiquities in the well-known person of M. Kabbadias. The Federal Government of Switzerland subsidises its Society for the Preservation of the Historical Monuments of Art. In Denmark and Sweden and Norway there are state conservators of monuments, each of whom joins with this office that of director of the National Museum of Antiquities in his own capital. Spain has a fully developed apparatus for conservation in the form of provincial commissions, the operations of which were regulated by an important royal decree in 1865. These commissions classify the most important monuments, and consider all questions of upkeep and restoration. In 1900 a royal decree gave direction for drawing up an inventory of the artistic treasures of the nation; and in the same year a draft Monument Act was laid before the Senate, but was afterwards withdrawn for further consideration. Belgium has possessed a Royal Commission on Monuments since 1835; and there has recently been shown considerable activity, in semi-official and private circles, in connexion with the care of historical monuments, with which the kingdom is so amply provided. In Holland a State Commission was formed in 1903, under the presidency of Dr P. J. H. Cuypers, to draw up an inventory of the artistic treasures of the realm, and to prepare for the full scientific publication of those of special interest.

Passing now to the subject of legislative enactments, we note that in most cases these commissions and conservators have no power of legal compulsion over the owners of the monuments which they have under supervision. The Austrian Central-Commission, august and influential as it is, can only bring private pressure to bear on any proprietor who proposes to act in a manner

detrimental to the national interest in this respect. In the first fifty years of its existence the French Commission was equally powerless. Even in the case of monuments belonging to the State, if these happened to be under a different department from that of the Fine Arts, they were little safer than if they had been in private hands. It was of no avail for the Commission to 'class' the Palace at Avignon if the Minister of War, in whose control the building stood, insisted, for military reasons, in tampering with the structure. Over monuments in private ownership no direct legal power could be exercised; but there always existed in the background a form of procedure which, though not devised for the sake of protecting artistic monuments, might, by a generous construction of its terms, be used for that purpose. This is the process of compulsory purchase—in French, 'expropriation'; in German, 'Enteignung.' All civilised states possess this power, without which few railways or even roads could be made. The French legal code admitted 'expropriation' for reasons of public utility. In our own country it is more than doubtful whether this would be held to cover considerations of art and history; but in France a more generous interpretation prevails, and it has been laid down by ministers in the Chamber, and acted on in practice, that it is a matter of public utility that protection should be extended to a monument that speaks of the past greatness of a place, or furnishes a model of style or of treatment to the craftsman of to-day. On this point M. Martin, Keeper of the Seal, made, in 1841, a declaration that has become classical:—

'Public utility is not a purely material thing; national traditions, history, art itself, are they not, in truth, matters of public utility, just as much as bridges and arsenals and roads?'

In Prussia also the general law of the State has been held, though more doubtfully, to sanction compulsory purchase for æsthetic reasons. But the whole question is by no means clear; and the need for defining these powers more distinctly, as well as for securing a firmer hold over monuments in the possession of departments of State or public bodies, has sharpened the demand for legislation which has been urged upon many governments

during the past generation. Monument Acts are sufficiently numerous.* Some of them are concerned primarily with artistic treasures of a movable kind, or with the proper regulation of excavations, or with other considerations foreign to the special scope of the present article. For the purpose in hand we need only regard those provisions which concern architectural monuments. In this respect the chief difficulty in the way of those in charge of the Acts has been to overcome the reluctance of legislators—themselves in many cases owners of property—to allow any interference with private rights. These laws have generally been more severe in their earlier drafts than in their final shape; and Lord Avebury fought for ten years before he could pass the English Ancient Monuments Protection Act of 1882, though its interference with these sacred rights was slight indeed.

For the present purpose the three recent monument Acts of France (1887) and Italy and Hesse (1902) may be regarded as a single body of legislation, though the principle of 'classement' is carried out more strictly in the French Act than in the others. The former only applies to the selected structures which the Commission has 'classed.' If these belong to the State, but are under a separate department, arbitration is arranged between the ministers interested. Such monuments, and those belonging to public bodies over which the State has some control, cannot be touched without permission of the Minister of Public Instruction and of the Fine Arts. If the monument be in the hands of private associations or individuals, it cannot be 'classed' without the consent of the proprietor. If he refuse his consent, the monument can be acquired for the State by compulsory purchase. If his consent be given, then the monument is protected as described above.

* The list of European countries which have passed Monument Acts comprises the following: Greece, 1834 and 1902; Hungary, 1881; England, 1882; Turkey, 1884; France, 1887; Bulgaria, 1889; Roumania, 1892; Vaud (Switzerland), 1898; Italy, Hesse-Darmstadt, Berne, and Neuchâtel (Switzerland), 1902. The Austrian Empire, Spain, Bavaria, and Baden, have drafts of laws under consideration. Prussia, as has been said, has had the matter in view for eighty years; and in the autumn of 1904 a legal commission was examining a proposed draft which may shortly become law. All recent efforts at monument legislation are noticed in the valuable French publication, the '*Annuaire de Législation Étrangère*.'

The Italian and Hessian laws contain provisions of the same general character; but in the last-named there is a seemingly insignificant article of a decentralising purport that might become of great importance. This is the provision (art. 19) that the State may delegate its power of expropriation under the law to local bodies such as our county and urban councils. The significance of this will be seen when we go on to consider briefly the third point set for consideration, that is, local building regulations passed by towns or districts for the protection of their characteristic monuments. These regulations are framed in accordance with Local Government Acts which allow to municipalities a certain freedom in domestic legislation. When applied with tact and moderation they are found to be valuable instruments in the hands of those anxious to preserve the traditional appearance of historic cities. It is to Germany that we must turn to see these local regulations in force. The independence of the older cities, already spoken of, finds here a natural outcome. Most of these cities have formed local associations in aid of amenity. Frankfort, Lübeck, Hildesheim, Nuremberg, Augsburg, Bamberg, Rothenburg, Würzburg, and other towns have formulated regulations to which buildings in their more central and important streets and places are bound to conform.

As regards the practical working of this system, the burgomaster of Hildesheim reported in 1902 that in that city in no single instance had the local building regulations been resisted, and that they had worked in the most beneficial fashion. The existence of rescripts of the kind had greatly strengthened the hands of those working to influence public opinion in the right direction. It is not to be wondered at, however, that there should be a demand for new state legislation of a definite kind on this important subject; and in March 1903 a petition from societies interested was accepted for consideration by the Prussian House of Peers. The following is the gist of the legislation asked for. No buildings in public or private hands of lasting historical or artistic value, or of special importance in relation to their surroundings, are to be destroyed; no alterations are to be made on them except in accordance with the style of the building itself and of those about it; and in certain stated parts

of cities no new buildings are to be erected out of harmony with the character of the surroundings.

When we compare this ample machinery with what is done in our own country, we find here only certain shy and tentative efforts at arrangements which on the Continent are in full working order. Some of the functions of a continental minister in charge of the fine arts are filled among ourselves by the First Commissioner of Works; and grateful recognition should be accorded to the services rendered to the cause by ministers in this position. It is work, however, that is done in a measure *sub rosa*, and often only semi-officially. Of official measures the British Isles possess the following: (1) the Ancient Monuments Protection Act, 1882, 45 & 46 Vict. cap. 73; (2) the Ancient Monuments Protection (Ireland) Act, 1892, 55 & 56 Vict. cap. 46; (3) the Ancient Monuments Protection Act, 1900, 63 & 64 Vict. cap. 34; (4) one or two provisions in municipal Acts applying to special towns or districts. The Act of 1882, called, after its author, Sir John Lubbock's Act, was based on a schedule of ancient monuments of outstanding importance drawn up by societies or committees of archæologists in the three kingdoms. This embraced sixty-eight monuments, or groups of monuments, in Great Britain and Ireland, belonging, with about half-a-dozen exceptions, to the class generally termed prehistoric. The main provision of the short Act itself was to the effect that the owner of any ancient monument to which the Act applied might constitute the Commissioners of Works guardians of such monument; and that in such case the Commissioners should be thenceforward responsible for its upkeep, and for this purpose should have reasonable rights of access to it. The cost was to be defrayed 'from moneys to be provided by Parliament.' The Commissioners were on their side empowered to prevent any injury being done to the monument even by the owner thereof. It was further provided that other ancient monuments not in the original schedule might, at the request of their owners, be taken over in similar fashion into guardianship. Down to the present date twenty-four of the original sixty-eight monuments have been placed under the Commissioners of Works; and eighteen fresh monuments, not in the original schedule,

have been added, all in England and Scotland, so that there are now in all forty-one in Great Britain under the protection of the law. So far as any expenditure is concerned, these Acts have in Britain become almost a dead letter; and, since the death in 1900 of the Inspector of Ancient Monuments, General Pitt-Rivers, no successor has been appointed to the post.

The case of Ireland has to be dealt with separately from that of Great Britain, though the Act of 1882 applied as much to Ireland as to any other part of the British Isles. As is usual with that much persecuted country, distressful Erin has had far better and more liberal treatment in the matter of monuments than the sister kingdoms. When the Irish Church Act of 1869 was passed, many churches worthy of preservation on artistic or historical grounds had fallen out of use. These buildings were accordingly placed in the hands of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, to be preserved as national monuments; and a sum of 50,000*l.* was set apart for their maintenance. At the time of the passing of the Ancient Monuments Act of 1882, 134 old Irish ecclesiastical buildings were in the charge of the Commissioners; and under the Act of 1882 they received the guardianship of seven monuments of the prehistoric class. In 1892 a special Act was passed for Ireland extending the operations of the Act of 1882 to any ancient or medieval structure or monument with respect to which the Commissioners of Works are of opinion that its preservation is a matter of public interest by reason of the historic, traditional, or artistic interest attaching thereto. This can only, however, be done at the request of the owner of the monument. Under this Act of 1892 forty-eight monuments, chiefly abbey ruins, ancient churches, round towers, and the like, have been added to the list; so that the whole number under the guardianship of the Board of Public Works in Ireland at the close of the year 1904 amounted to 189. There is available for their maintenance a yearly sum of about 1000*l.*, which contrasts markedly with the niggardly supplies on which the monuments in Britain starve.

The English official intelligence, toiling after the nimble Irish wit, achieved in 1900 'an Act to amend the Ancient Monuments Protection Act, 1882,' by which the

provisions of the Irish Act of 1892 were applied to England and Scotland, but in an amplified form, in accordance with which county councils have the same powers that were conferred in Ireland in 1882 and 1892 on the Commissioners of Works. This provision is very important, as introducing the German and Italian system of local organisation in place of the centralisation of the former Acts. There is another clause to the effect that Commissioners of Works or county councils may receive voluntary contributions towards the upkeep of any monument under their charge, and enter into agreements with an owner, 'or with any other person,' 'as to such maintenance and preservation and the cost thereof.' This again is a beneficial provision, since it brings official authorities into touch with private societies, such, for example, as the National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty, as well as with individuals who may take personal or local interest in some monument or group. This combined action of official and private agencies is of the utmost importance for a satisfactory treatment of the monument question; and the want of such action in over-centralised France is specially commented on by Dr Clemen in his work on the subject. A provision for public access to monuments under the Act forms a useful adjunct, as there is no such provision in the original Act of 1882. Such access is, however, still subject to the good pleasure of the owner.

Under the law of 1900 no action has been taken from the side of the Commissioners of Works; but there is a prospect of some activity among local authorities. Already, in 1898, the London County Council had obtained the insertion of a clause in its General Powers Act of that year enabling it to purchase by agreement buildings and places of historical or architectural interest, and to undertake their maintenance; and in April 1900 the Council purchased for a considerable sum a notable old house in Fleet Street for the purpose of preserving it as a historical monument, while utilising it at the same time for modern ends.

Another function with regard to ancient monuments which foreign states acknowledge as a duty, but to which British Governments have not set their hand, has

been also undertaken by the London County Council, viz. the preparation of an inventory or register. The report of the Council for 1902-3 says: 'At an early stage the Council came to the conclusion that it would be desirable for a register to be compiled of historic buildings remaining in London.' Such a register had been already begun by a private society for the survey of the memorials of greater London; and the County Council, taking over this work, has issued one volume, compiled under the direction of Mr C. R. Ashbee, dealing with the parish of Bromley-by-Bow. The work has, for the moment, been discontinued, but will probably be carried forward on somewhat less ample lines. An inventory of houses and other buildings of historical and artistic interest in Edinburgh is also under consideration by the Town Council of that ancient city.*

The legislation already described represents important first steps towards a work which lies at the very foundation of a properly organised care of ancient monuments. It has been seen that in every European country, whether formal Monument Acts exist or not, the task of cataloguing is in full progress; and it is recognised that, before the national heritage in these possessions can be properly safeguarded, it must be known in what that heritage consists. In our own country, in one particular department of monument lore—that concerned with manuscripts—this work of cataloguing was undertaken many years ago; and the Historical Manuscripts Commission has done invaluable work in examining and describing the contents of British muniment chests, both public and private. Here is a precedent that might well be followed in regard to monuments in general. The appointment of a royal commission, with a view to the preparation of an inventory of all monuments of artistic or historical importance throughout the British Isles, is probably the most effective practical step which Government could take, while, at the same time, it is the easiest. A very considerable amount of the work involved has been already done; and, for a good part of the rest, voluntary

* As an example of what is done in this way abroad, it may be mentioned that in 1903 there was published at Lyons an excellent '*Inventaire Général du Vieux-Lyon*,' with a notice of all the old houses of interest.

workers would certainly be forthcoming. The function of a commission would be to systematise and co-ordinate what has been accomplished or is still in progress, and to provide for the filling-up of *lacunæ*. It would not be sufficient to leave the whole work to local bodies; for unless the Government give a lead, the movement will be only spasmodic and partial.

A provincial borough in the north of England has lately supplied a pertinent object-lesson on the value of inventories of this kind. The town of Penrith possessed a couple of neo-classic house-fronts, probably designed by Robert Adam, and at any rate excellent specimens of the Adam style. Early in 1905 the urban councillors acquired the houses as a site for a town-hall, and resolved to demolish their valuable façades for the sake of replacing them by a modern structure after their own hearts. Protests were raised, but in vain; and the houses were hurried out of existence. The only plea by which the majority who decided on this piece of wasteful destruction could save their faces was that they did not know early enough that the houses were of value. They protested that, had the artistic and historical worth of the structures been recognised in time, the case would have been altered. The upshot is that the town itself, and the country generally, are the poorer by the loss of excellent work that can never be replaced, all because Penrith was without any such survey or inventory of its artistic treasures, the pressing need of which is here maintained.

Apart from the practical work of the preparation of an inventory, such a royal commission would perform a very useful function in considering and reporting on the question of the ownership of national monuments, and on the expediency of arming the executive with powers, to be used only in the last resort, of expropriating private owners on artistic or historical grounds. Our own Act of 1882 expressly refuses this power to the executive; but it has been already noticed that in foreign Monument Acts provisions of the kind are constant features. That a town council, as in the case of Newcastle, should not have property in its own city walls and towers, and that a private owner, who may be seised of some ancient monument of absolutely unique value, should be legally empowered to dispose of it to a foreign purchaser

are anomalies that would be hard to parallel outside our own borders. The relation of ecclesiastical bodies and persons to the treasures of medieval art actually within their keeping is another matter in which enquiry may become advisable. Hitherto, in the ecclesiastical mind, the sense of the historical continuity of the Church has been strong enough to invest the buildings and objects that represent this continuity with an inviolable sacredness; but will this feeling necessarily last? The power of money, when lavishly dispensed, is terribly great; and there have recently appeared some ominous signs that the sacredness referred to may become obsolete.

It is quite conceivable that the report of such a royal commission as is here contemplated might lead to legislative action in this country similar to the action which is being taken in so many quarters abroad. Apart, however, from the question of any general Monument Act of a sweeping kind, much may be done by permissive legislation, opening the way to local action in favour of preservation. The Act of 1900 gave certain powers to county councils, of which advantage is already being taken. Besides the action of the London County Council already described, the Northamptonshire County Council has moved in the case of the Queen Eleanor crosses within its jurisdiction, and has taken into guardianship the cross near the county town; it is also giving attention to the medieval bridges of the county. Urban bodies might similarly be encouraged to protect their civic possessions. There are two methods of procedure here. A local body may, on its own initiative, apply for certain special powers. Thus, by the Chester Improvement Act of 1884, no new erections of any kind are allowed to abut on the city walls save with consent of the Corporation; and Edinburgh, in 1899, obtained certain powers in advance of anything previously granted by Parliament for checking the abuses of advertisements.

On the other hand, the legislature may pass a permissive Act, like that of 1900, under which any local body may move at its will. The advantage of government initiative for the purpose in view has already been pointed out; and this applies especially to monuments in civic custody. County councils are evidently preparing to take up this part of the work open to them;

but the attitude of municipal bodies is by no means so encouraging. State recognition of the value of these older buildings would impress upon the minds of city representatives the importance of interests which are continually being thrust aside by utilitarian claims. As matters now stand, when acts of destruction are contemplated, like those at Berwick or Croydon or Penrith, the whole case for defence has to be built up from the foundation and argued out on first principles in memorials and letters to the local journal.

What is urgently required is a firmly expressed declaration on the part of the Government that this department of the national assets is of the highest intrinsic value, and that it behoves every public body to give serious attention to that portion of these assets over which it has control. The arguments that make for preservation should be stated in an authoritative document that will command attention, and to which reference can always be made. This does not mean that preservation is to be rendered in every case obligatory. It is at times impossible to arrest natural decay, which may decide the fate of structures we would gladly retain; and the exigencies of the present may at other times outweigh all other considerations. What government action would secure is the acceptance of the general principle that these things are of great value, and that a strenuous effort must in every case be made to hold them inviolate. When these principles, which underlie all intelligent efforts at preservation, are accepted as of unquestionable validity, the special features of each case as it arises can be dispassionately considered on their merits. There is no necessity for the practical interference of a government department in all these local questions. If Government will only establish on broad lines a national policy, it may safely be left to the patriotism of each province or city to supervise its working.

Art. IX.—THE EARLY ROMAN EMPERORS.

1. *Cæsar's Conquest of Gaul.* By T. Rice Holmes. New edition. London: Macmillan, 1903.
2. *Portraits of Julius Cæsar.* By Frank J. Scott. London: Longmans, 1903.
3. *Augustus.* By E. S. Shuckburgh. London: Fisher Unwin, 1903.
4. *Augustus und seine Zeit.* By V. Gardthausen. Leipzig: Teubner, 1891-1904.
5. *Kaiser Augustus.* By Otto Seeck. Leipzig: Velhagen, 1902.
6. *Tiberius the Tyrant.* By J. C. Tarver. London: Constable, 1902.
7. *Caligula.* By H. Willrich. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte, 1903.
8. *The Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero.* By B. W. Henderson. London: Methuen, 1903.
9. *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius.* By Samuel Dill. London: Macmillan, 1904.

HISTORIANS do not always find it easy to hold the balance evenly between their interest in the things that have been done and their interest in the men who did them. If history has sometimes been dissolved into biographies, there have also been instances where the supreme importance of the work achieved, and the difficulty of getting into close touch with the prominent actors, have led to an almost impersonal treatment of the subject, to a history without names. In the case of the period which extends from the first dictatorship of Julius to the death of Nero, the temptation to adopt this method of writing history is strong. The unsatisfactory nature of the literary tradition, and the rapid accumulation of evidence derived from other sources, have diverted students from the dubious and often pitiful records of the characters and careers of the individual Cæsars to an examination of the nature and working of the political system under which the civilised world lived for three centuries.

A powerful impulse was given to this tendency by the publication in 1875 of the volume of Mommsen's '*Staatsrecht*' which dealt with the principate. It contained the first intelligible account of that anomalous form of govern-

ment for which the masterful genius of Julius had cleared the ground, which the statecraft of Augustus established, and which gradually developed under, and almost in spite of, his immediate successors. Mommsen's insight into Roman methods and habits of thought, his familiarity with Roman law and legal conceptions, above all his unequalled mastery of the evidence, enabled him to analyse and explain with a clearness never before attained, the nature of the famous compromise which gave Rome 'peace and a princeps,' and by which the republic was restored only to wither away into nothingness.

Ten years later Mommsen followed up his exposition of the legal structure of the principate by publishing the fifth volume of the 'Roman History,' the volume dealing with the provinces of the empire from the time of Julius to that of Diocletian. It was a marvellous effort of constructive historical imagination. In a series of brilliant chapters the principate was shown actually at work, where, as the author declares, 'its work is to be sought and to be found,' in the growing civilisations of Africa, Spain, and Gaul, in the frontier camps on Rhine or Danube, or where Greeks and Orientals lived securely under the protection of Cæsar. The picture drawn presented a welcome contrast to that which Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio had made familiar, and rendered what Tacitus himself has called the 'cramped and inglorious task' of recording the vices, cruelties, and crimes of a Gaius or Nero even more distasteful than before.

The personal problem is, however, one that neither human curiosity nor the requirements of historical study allow us to set aside; and the list of books prefixed to this article shows, not only that interest in the problem is reviving, but that scholars are endeavouring to solve it. It may be worth while to ask if we are at all nearer to a solution than we were.

Two confessions must be made at once. The literary evidence is much what it was when the Abbé Tillemont wrote his history of the emperors more than a century and a half ago. Even the tombs and rubbish-heaps of Egypt have not yielded a single fragment of the lost original authorities whom Tacitus and Suetonius followed. The epigraphic evidence, it is true, has enormously increased in volume, but its value mainly consists in the

light which it has thrown on the system of imperial administration, and on the political, social, and economic conditions of the time; of the personalities of the rulers it has little to say. So far as the personal history and characters of the early Cæsars are concerned, only one document, the official record of the celebration of the Secular games in 17 B.C., has been found which can rank with the Ancyran monument or even with the bronze tablet at Lyons containing the famous speech of Claudius.

Yet, as a perusal of such works as Gardthausen's elaborate biography of Augustus, or Mr Henderson's brilliant, if not always convincing, study of Nero, will show, we do not stand to-day precisely where scholars stood forty or fifty years ago. Though Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio are still our chief authorities, we are better equipped for understanding them. The department of historical investigation known as the 'criticism of sources' has made great strides of late years, and it has taught us much as to the authorities whom these writers followed, their methods of using them, and the standpoint from which they regarded the period of which they wrote. Moreover, our greatly increased knowledge of the political system, and of the general conditions existing in the empire, has inevitably modified our views of the Cæsars themselves.

It is, no doubt, with the successors of Julius and Augustus, with Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius, and Nero, that critics of the literary tradition have been most busy; and it is round the figures of these *epigoni* that the battle has been hottest. Yet even in the case of the two greatest of the Cæsars there are difficulties to be met and questions to be answered before final judgment can be given.

At the head of the list of books prefixed to this article we have placed two which deal with Julius—Mr Rice Holmes's admirable narrative of Cæsar's conquests in Gaul and Mr Scott's monograph on the 'Portraits of Julius Cæsar.' They afford an excellent illustration of the precise problem which confronts the historian in this instance. Mr Holmes's feet are planted on the firm ground of Cæsar's Commentaries; and, notwithstanding difficulties in detail, chronological, topographical and otherwise, the figure of the great proconsul and the record of his doings are both clear and intel-

ligible. On the other hand, Mr Scott's search after the lineaments of Cæsar the dictator leaves the reader, as it seems to have left the author, in much uncertainty.

The truth is that, down to a certain point in his career, we know Cæsar more intimately than we know most of the great men of classical history. Thanks to Cicero and Sallust we are able to get very near to the brilliant and versatile patrician who dared to beard Sulla at the height of his power, the astute and aspiring politician whose personal qualities attracted Cicero as much as his ambitious designs alarmed him. After Cæsar exchanged the troubled politics of the Forum and senate-house for the proconsulship of Gaul, we can, with the aid of his own Commentaries, follow him closely in his work as the soldier and statesman who not only conquered the Gaulish clans, but won their loyalty for himself and for Rome. Even of Cæsar, as the daring and successful revolutionary general who, to the amazement of the world, met and defeated the invincible Pompey, the impression left by the records is vivid and consistent. So far we are dealing with an intensely human figure, the leading characteristics of which are unmistakable. The qualities by which he was best remembered in tradition, and on which most of the stories told about him turn, are conspicuous throughout—his personal charm, his varied accomplishments and wide interests, no less than his unfailing readiness of resource, his clear insight into men and things, his boundless self-confidence, and the ambition which, in the words of his remote successor Julian, would lead him to strive for supremacy even with Zeus.

But there is another Cæsar, a much less human and a more evasive figure, whom it is not so easy to fix and describe. In attempting the portrait of Cæsar the dictator, the absolute master for a brief space of the Roman state and empire, we are left to work with rather scanty material. We have no longer the guidance of his own Commentaries. Cicero, divided between his personal liking for Cæsar and his detestation of the new régime, turns his head away from this part of his career. We are thrown back on far inferior authorities of a later date, on Plutarch, Suetonius, and Dio. Nor does the evidence of inscriptions and monuments compensate, to any great extent, for the failure of the literary record.

Some facts are indeed beyond dispute. The clemency which Cæsar showed to opponents was a welcome surprise to men who remembered the 'Sullan domination.' But his rule was also characteristically vigorous and high-handed, for Cæsar had lost none of his old contempt for established forms and traditions. Nor did he fail to show his capacity for grappling at once and effectively with the urgent problems of the moment. Yet such measures as his reform of the calendar, or of the taxation of the province of Asia, or the compromise by which he staved off an imminent financial crisis, give us no clue to his general policy. And when we proceed to ask on what lines he proposed to reconstruct the commonwealth, the poverty of the material for an answer becomes plainer still.

The view is widely held that Cæsar contemplated substituting for the old city-state, with its subject allies, a single 'world-state' of which Rome might be the capital but not the mistress. Yet the evidence on which this view rests is far from convincing. Cæsar, as became a former leader of the popular party, and a kinsman of the man who carried the law enfranchising the Italians, was very probably favourable to a liberal policy in dealing with the citizenship. But, though he redeemed a pledge given in 65 B.C. and enfranchised the Transpadanes, and was generous both with Roman citizenship and with Latin rights in districts already so Roman in language and habits as Sicily and southern Gaul, there is no proof that he either made or contemplated making any wholesale grant of the Roman franchise. Nor is it safe to argue that, because he admitted into the senate a few 'half-barbarous Gauls,' he intended to make of the senate an imperial council, though it may well be that he wished to render it more amenable to his own will by the introduction of men, whether Gauls or old soldiers, who were loyal to himself. Sulla, who has never been suspected of imperial views, had also increased the numbers of the senate and placed on its roll partisans and creatures of his own. More hazardous still are the inferences drawn from the fragments of the law which critics are agreed in identifying with the Julian municipal law referred to by Cicero. It may be granted that the law was a statesmanlike attempt to introduce regularity and uniformity into the medley of municipal institutions, of various

dates, existing in Italy, and that its principles were intended to govern also the constitutions of all municipalities which might be established in the future. But the fact that, for some unexplained reason, clauses dealing with certain details of the local government of Rome are prefixed to the municipal law proper, does not justify the inference that Cæsar intended to lower Rome to the position of being only one, even though the foremost, among Italian towns.

If we cannot be sure what Cæsar meant to make of the Roman state, we are almost equally in the dark as to the shape which he intended that its government should assume. We may, of course, dismiss the idea that he contemplated a restoration of the republic in any real sense. The necessity for some centralised personal authority was patent; and Cæsar had used plain language about the ancient republican constitution. It is almost as unlikely that he had fixed on the dictatorship as the form under which the supreme power should be permanently exercised. Beyond this all is conjecture. There is much plausibility in the theory advocated, among others, by Dr E. Meyer, one of the ablest living German historians, that Cæsar intended to place at the head of the state a king, not, as Mommsen suggested, of the old Roman type, but after the pattern of the Hellenistic monarchies of the Seleucids and Ptolemies. The extravagant honours which Cæsar allowed to be heaped upon him gave significance to the talk of a proposal to allow him to assume the title 'Basileus' and the kingly tiara, while engaged in his projected Parthian campaign. His claim to descent from Venus Genetrix, in whose honour he built a temple in Rome, was carried a step farther by the Greeks of Asia. In a decree of the council of Ephesus he is described as 'the god made manifest, the son of Ares and Aphrodite.' His intimacy with Cleopatra, and the rumoured preference which he showed for his son by her, may have raised the suspicion that he contemplated not only an eastern title, but an eastern capital. Finally, the emphatically Roman policy of Augustus was possibly prompted by anxiety to prove his innocence of any such un-Roman designs as those attributed to his adoptive father. But, though Cæsar's usually clear judgment may have been temporarily warped by success and flattery, it

is difficult to believe that he would have permanently adopted a policy so alien to Roman feeling and so certain to imperil Latin civilisation.

It is safer to resign ourselves to a frank confession that we have no satisfactory clue to Cæsar's views for the future, even assuming that he had been able to form any. It is best to leave him where Roman tradition placed him, the deified progenitor, the eponymous ancestor of the long line of the Cæsars, whose temple stood in the Forum and whose star was seen in the heavens, but whose tragic death, and the chaos which followed, separated him as by a wide gulf from the new order of things shaped and settled by Augustus.

For it was always to Augustus that men looked back as the actual founder of the rule of the Cæsars. The powers given in turn to each emperor were those given first of all to Augustus; and the moment when, to quote the language of an edict of Vespasian, 'Augustus got hold of the commonwealth,' was that from which the existing arrangements of the Roman state were dated. His proverbial good fortune while alive has not failed him since. It gave him what was denied to the other Cæsars of the first century, a successor who revered his memory and loyally carried on his policy, and historians who, though lost to us, worthily and faithfully recorded his achievements. The result has been that, though the unfavourable criticisms passed on him, as Tacitus tells us, after his death have been repeated at intervals ever since, his position has never been seriously challenged. The Octavian of the triumvirate and the proscriptions has been almost forgotten in the Augustus who, like his prototype Æneas, emerged from the dark days of the civil wars purified and strengthened for his work of restoration.

It is as the man who restored peace and order, and inaugurated a new era of justice, clemency, and virtue, that he was remembered even in the doggerel verses of the Middle Ages:—

'Salvator voluit sub tanto principe nasci,
Nam pax sub pacis principe nata fuit.'

It is under this aspect that Augustus is revealed in two striking memorials of his principate, both of which have been discovered within the last fifteen years. They may

claim a brief notice here, if only because Mr Shuckburgh, in his careful life of Augustus, seems scarcely to realise their importance as bringing vividly before us the strength and reality of the feelings which inspired the verses of Horace and Ovid. The first is the official record of the celebration of the Secular games in 17 B.C. which (we are quoting Mommsen), by the favour of the gods, 'quibus septem placuere colles,' was discovered in September 1890, during the construction of the new Tiber embankment. The record was graven on marble, by order of the senate, 'so that the memory of this great mercy of the gods may be preserved.' In interest it stands second only to the Ancyran monument, and it might well have found a place in Mr Shuckburgh's appendix along with that famous chronicle of the 'acts of the deified Augustus.'

It describes for us in detail the solemn ceremony which typified and commemorated the distinctive achievement of Augustus at what was the climax of his career. Peace had been established, and not without honour, for the Parthian had given back the standards lost at Carrhæ; the provincial administration had been reorganised; at home the old government had been restored, the old worship revived; and, only a few months before, laws had been passed which were to bring back the ancient virtues. And now on the first three days of June, B.C. 17, a date politely vouched for as the correct one by courtly lawyers and learned pontiffs, the old age, with its wars and massacres and vices, was to be buried, and the new age of peace and faith and purity was to be ushered in. We can read the preliminary instructions issued by Augustus himself, by the senate, and by the college of the 'Fifteen' specially charged with the arrangements for the ceremony. Then follows the record of the festival itself. The chief actors are the two men who had made it possible—the emperor, Cæsar Augustus, and his well-tryed friend and colleague, Marcus Agrippa. The spectators included all, whether Roman citizens or not, who cared to respond to the invitation to witness a spectacle which none had ever seen before and none would see again. On each night in the Campus Martius near the Tiber sacrifices were offered by Augustus himself to mother earth, to the 'Mœræ,' to the 'deis Ilithyis.' The sacrifices by day were offered by both Augustus and Agrippa, for the first

two days, in the Capitol to Jupiter 'greatest and best' and to Juno the queen. On the third, the great day of the feast, sacrifice was offered on the Palatine to Apollo and Diana; and then, the sacrifice completed, a chorus of young men and maidens chanted the secular hymn first on the Palatine and next in the Capitol. 'The hymn,' drily adds the official chronicle, 'was composed by Q. Horatius Flaccus.' It is but rarely in ancient history that we are able to get so near to a great popular ceremony, charged with deep emotions of gratitude and hope.

Four years after the celebration of the Secular games Augustus returned to Rome from his visit to the western provinces. Horace bears witness to the feelings with which his return was anticipated and welcomed; and the note struck is much the same as in the secular hymn. Augustus returns to find the new era of peace and virtue fairly begun, the old age already buried away out of sight. In commemoration of his return an altar was erected to the goddess of peace, 'Pax Augusta' herself, in the Campus Martius; and there each year 'magistrates, priests, and Vestal virgins were to offer sacrifice.' So much we learn from Augustus's own record of his life. But it is only within the last few years that it has been possible to realise something of the beauty and significance of this 'Altar of Peace.' Here, again, we have to regret an omission on Mr Shuckburgh's part; while Gardthausen, though his book was mostly published, like Mr Shuckburgh's, before the most recent excavations beneath the Ottoboni palace, has made good use of the researches of Von Duhn and Dr Petersen. For the historian, interest centres in the success which has rewarded the patient efforts of scholars to reconstruct, out of the scattered fragments which remain, the great series of reliefs which adorned the walls of the courtyard. The reliefs, the finest extant specimens of the art of the Augustan age, Greek in their grace and beauty, but with a stateliness and dignity genuinely Roman, show us a procession which may well have been that which celebrated either the foundation of the altar in 13 B.C., or its dedication in 9 B.C. The high officials of state are there, the priests and Vestal virgins, symbols of the restored republic and of the ancient faiths; but there also are the men who had achieved the great work which the altar

commemorated—Augustus, Agrippa, and with them, probably, the heroes of Rome's most recent victories, Tiberius and Drusus. Quite as much as the record of the Secular games, the frieze of the Altar of Peace enables us to realise the 'halo as of the dawn' which, in Mommsen's words, gave its peculiar glory to the reign of Augustus.

It must not, of course, be imagined that there are no points on which the historians of Augustus have differed. Was he in earnest about the restoration of the republic? Dr Meyer, in a brilliant little paper, argues warmly that he was. Gardthausen, in his elaborate study of Augustus, is equally positive that he was not. What view Mr Shuckburgh holds is not very clear. On the whole we think the balance of probability is on the side of Meyer, and that Augustus intended something more than a polite but unreal concession to Roman feeling. There are indications of a serious endeavour on his part to infuse life, not into the senate only, as Meyer's language might be taken to imply, but into the republican institutions as a whole. We need only refer to his attempts, quite unsuccessful it is true, to reinvigorate the popular assembly, and to charge the magistrates with a definite responsibility for the local government of Rome.

It is often urged that Augustus must have known that such attempts were doomed to failure. But, though we may grant that he miscalculated, it does not follow that he did not believe in his scheme, or that in January 27 B.C. he had not reasons for doing so. As to one condition of its successful working, his own moderation and self-restraint, he was presumably confident; and as to the other, it is by no means clear that he was bound to despair of the republic without further trial. The Roman community was not so corrupt and effete as the language of many historians would lead us to believe. Neither the remnant of the old nobility nor even the city populace were utterly rotten. As to the great body of Roman citizens, Augustus, himself Italian on his father's side, and knowing Italy well, may reasonably have argued that, although the civil wars and the prevailing insecurity of the last twenty years had rudely shaken the fabric of society and produced a temporary demoralisation, yet there existed germs of vigorous life which required only the restoration of peace, confidence, and settled

government to develop and expand. It was clearly to this Roman people, to the Italy of Virgil and Horace, that he looked. They had been alienated by the narrow exclusiveness which guided the policy of the later republic; they might now be invited to play their part in a wider Rome, not as the subjects, together with Greeks and barbarians, of a supreme despot, but as a self-governing imperial race. Nor was his confidence altogether misplaced; for, although little is said of it by ancient writers whose horizon was bounded by the walls of Rome, the century that followed the compromise of 27 B.C. witnessed a great outburst of vigour and a rapid diffusion of prosperity in Italy. In one respect, indeed, Augustus's hopes were falsified; the activities which he set free did not run in the channels which he had marked out for them. Their effects are seen in literature, in commerce and agriculture, and in municipal life; but they left untouched the ancient political institutions of the city state of Rome, the primary assembly, the elective magistracies, and even the senate. Yet Augustus's ideal was no unworthy one. He will never exercise over the imaginations of men the influence of Julius, but he saved for posterity a Latin civilisation, and postponed for two centuries the triumph of undisguised military despotism.

With the death of Augustus the criticism of the history of the Cæsars enters upon a new stage. The literary tradition of antiquity treated Augustus with respect; on his four next successors it passed a verdict of almost unqualified condemnation, for such comparatively lucid intervals as the first days of Tiberius or the 'quinquennium Neronis' only serve to deepen the prevailing gloom. This verdict has been repeatedly challenged; not only Tiberius and Claudius, but even Gaius and Nero have found able and zealous defenders who have unquestionably succeeded, notably in the case of Tiberius, in proving that the verdict was in part at least unjust. There is, however, a prior question which has hardly received its due share of attention, at any rate in this country. We may grant that Tiberius, for instance, was not so black as he is painted; but it is important to try to understand why he was painted so black. In other words, why did Tacitus—for it is he who has given the tradition

its currency and authority—paint the rule of the Cæsars from 14–69 A.D. in such unfavourable colours? The theory that he was himself malevolently disposed towards these Cæsars has deservedly fallen out of favour. We may accept his own statement that he was not moved either by resentment or affection. Very possibly he was not unwilling to set off by contrast the happiness of that ‘most blessed age’ in which he wrote; but we find it difficult to accept Mr Tarver’s ingenious theory that in blackening Tiberius, Tacitus is really taking his revenge upon Domitian.

Tacitus was, in truth, above all things an artist, aiming at painting, from the materials before him, a picture of the period with which he is concerned and of the chief actors in it. He found ready to his hand an established tradition of the characters and doings of the last four Cæsars of the Julio-Claudian line. This tradition, in the main, he accepts, and he sets himself to reproduce it as effectively as possible, throwing in skilful touches and deepening the shadows, so as to give the desired impression. He was not malevolent or dishonest, but he exerted the whole force of his genius to give to his own generation and to posterity a presentation of this old régime, with its extravagant luxury, wild excesses, and terrible catastrophes, which has held the attention of men ever since. It was a picture which not only he but his contemporaries were predisposed to accept without much question. For the comparatively sober, *bourgeois* society in which Tacitus lived the ‘ancien régime’ that perished with Nero had a weird fascination.

It is necessary, therefore, to go behind Tacitus to the tradition which he followed. It was a tradition bitterly hostile to the Cæsars; it emanated almost exclusively from writers who belonged to the senatorial order; and it reveals something like a standing feud between the Cæsars and the nobility of Rome. What, then, is the explanation of this feud? It is to be found, as Mr Dill has pointed out in one of the best passages in his book, not alone in the vices and faults of either emperors or nobles, but also in the political and social conditions of the time. The difficulties which these created became acute when death removed the great master of statecraft who had planned the delicate compromise on

which the principate rested, and whose unrivalled services to the state and consummate tact silenced opposition.

Tiberius has been often represented as making a new departure in policy; and a learned German writer describes his reign as a 'transition to tyranny.' In reality the most marked characteristic of Tiberius' policy is his unwavering attachment to that of Augustus, whose deeds and words 'were to him a law,' and whose 'advice was a command.' He did not enjoy the unique personal prestige of his predecessor; he was a soldier rather than a statesman, and by temperament as ill-fitted as Augustus was well-fitted for a policy of compromise. It is, moreover, easy to understand that the long duration of Augustus's principate had so strengthened the position of one party to the arrangement as to make the Augustan theory of a dual control far more difficult to work than had been the case forty years before. The pathos of Tiberius' situation lies in his conscientious efforts to carry on a policy which was becoming every year less practicable, which was in many ways repugnant to his own temper, and which tried his patience to the breaking-point. At each step the difficulties and the friction increased. Even in the department of foreign policy his loyal adherence to the 'maxims of Augustus' gave occasion for sneers, to which Tacitus, true to his artistic method, has given epigrammatic force and a permanent place in literature. His recall of Germanicus, his indifference to Britain, his temporising policy in the East, were all, as Tacitus incidentally lets us know, in strict accordance with Augustan rules; but almost in the same breath they are quoted as proofs of his jealousy of rivals, his inertness or his vacillation. More serious were the difficulties at home. It is, we think, beyond dispute that Tiberius endeavoured, with almost pathetic fidelity, to respect the two fundamental assumptions on which the compact of 27 B.C. rested—that the republic had been restored, and that the *princeps* was no more than a private citizen entrusted by senate and people with powers wider than those of any of his colleagues, but still limited and defined. At the outset Tiberius's deference to consuls and senate alarmed that experienced adviser, his mother Livia. Throughout the first twelve years of his principate he made constant use of the senate as

his advisory council, consulting it even on matters which touched the 'arcana imperii' so nearly as the enlistment and discharge of soldiers, or correspondence with foreign powers. While the proconsuls of public provinces were reminded that they were responsible, not to him, but to consuls and senate, he insisted that his own servants should remember that they were not officials of state. He was equally resolute in avoiding the outward accessories of monarchy; and here, no doubt, the theory of the constitution coincided with his own tastes.

But he was attempting the impossible. No effective partnership was possible where the real strength was all on one side. Nor was it possible to remain only the first citizen of the republic when he was frankly acknowledged as a monarch. The difficulty of governing efficiently under a system which he increasingly felt to be impracticable, but which loyalty forbade him to abandon, fretted and soured his somewhat dour temper. The effect was equally unfortunate on public opinion in Rome, especially among the senatorial nobility. Some resented the attempt to play the citizen on the part of a man who had none of Augustus's civilities, and neither provided nor shared in the amusements of the people. In others his reserve excited suspicion, which, after his withdrawal to Capri, took shape in the wildest gossip as to his private life. The mass of the senators were equally unwilling to take their partnership in the government seriously, and resentful of any attempt to ignore their claims. In a few cases other motives were at work—the pride of birth, which refused to acknowledge a superior even in a Claudius, or a sentimental republicanism which fed on the traditions of Cato or of Brutus.

To these causes of friction and mutual mistrust and suspicion must be added the general sense of insecurity and the plentiful crop of intrigues due to what was an essential feature in the Augustan system, the open question of the succession. It was this more than anything else which encouraged conspiracy and family feuds and lent a dangerous significance to the influence which might be gained over Tiberius by those nearest to him, his mother or Agrippina, or a too powerful prefect of the prætorium. The situation grew steadily worse. He was soured by the consciousness that his loyalty to the

maxims of Augustus had made him unpopular without any good results. His reserve and his mistrust increased. He left Rome in weariness and disgust, only to find that his absence intensified suspicion and encouraged intrigue. The gloom of the last few years weighed heavily both on Rome and on Tiberius, now (to quote his own words) 'an old man and alone.' But it had a more far-reaching effect. It gave to the contemporary literature its tone of bitter hostility, and so provided the materials for that portrait of Tiberius which, thanks to the genius of Tacitus, has fascinated posterity.

At the present day we listen readily enough to the apologists of Tiberius. With his successor, Gaius, the case is different. Yet it is not impossible to make Gaius, not perhaps more admirable, but at least more intelligible. Herr Willrich, in his careful study of Gaius, or 'Caligula,' as he prefers to call him, does not profess to undertake the task of white-washing him. He does not deny his extravagance, vanity, and cruelty, nor, we think, does he disturb the fixed belief of Gaius's contemporaries, that the illness which seized him early in his principate unhinged his mind and clouded his judgment. Yet he has rendered good service by insisting that many of the features in Gaius's policy which most bitterly offended Roman society, and have been ever since quoted as indications of mental disease, are directly connected with a political theory which, though at variance with the Augustan system, had never been without adherents since the days of Julius, and was carried out by Gaius with characteristic extravagance and disregard of consequences. If the principate of Tiberius illustrates the difficulty of working the plan of a dual control of the empire, the rule of Gaius shows how near the sober principate of Augustus stood to an avowed monarchy of the Hellenistic type. The tendency to treat the princeps as much more than first citizen, or even first magistrate, was already strong. The half-orientalised Greeks of his household easily transferred to their lord and master the language long familiar in the courts of the East. The provincials of Asia Minor habitually overstepped the limits imposed on their devotion by Augustus and Tiberius; and even Westerns like Seneca allowed themselves to speak of the Cæsars in terms of almost Oriental servility.

This growing extravagance of homage had been sternly checked by Tiberius. But Gaius had been bred amid influences which inclined him to welcome it as his due and frankly to accept the position of more than human pre-eminence assigned to him. In the palace of his grandmother, Antonia, he breathed an atmosphere very different from that which surrounded either Tiberius or even Livia; for the latter, though autocratic in temper and policy, was Roman to the core. Antonia herself, after the withdrawal of Tiberius to Capri and the death of Livia, was the prominent representative in Rome of the house of the Cæsars. Her palace must have been a powerful social and political centre. L. Vitellius, Valerius Asiaticus, and Vespasian haunted her reception-rooms and paid court to her freedmen and freedwomen. From among the former came some of the prominent favourites and servants of succeeding emperors, Pallas and his brother Felix, probably also Callistus. Through her father, Antony, she had numerous affinities with the ruling houses of the native states which still flourished under the suzerainty of Rome, and, above all, with those of the East, the 'orientis regna,' with Thrace and Pontus, and with the Herods. Her palace, with its traditions of Antony, was their natural meeting-place in Rome. Here they cultivated relations with the powerful and astute freedmen, and here paid their court to the destined successor of Tiberius, the young Gaius. They pandered to his tastes, flattered his vanity, and instilled into him the ideas of sovereignty as they understood it; they became his 'instructors in tyranny.' The lessons they taught were perfectly learnt. Almost from the first Gaius posed as a monarch of the Greco-Oriental type. His accession dispelled the dark clouds that had gathered over the empire during the last years of Tiberius. 'The newly risen sun-god,' so runs an inscription of the time, 'lighted up with the brightness of his rays the kingdoms of his empire'; for he was like his eastern models, at once divine and a king of kings.

The verdict of tradition upon Gaius's successor, Claudius, is thoroughly characteristic of the time. The uncle is not denounced with the bitterness excited by the nephew's cruelties, but he is ridiculed and despised; and the reason is plain. Claudius, as even the tradition allows us to see,

had merits as a man and a ruler; but his merits and demerits were almost equally distasteful to Roman society, since both ran counter to its most cherished prejudices. Born in an age keenly susceptible to physical beauty, and in a family conspicuous for the possession of it, Claudius was awkward and ungainly almost to deformity. The son of Drusus and the brother of Germanicus was shrewdly suspected of being a coward. He succeeded to the principate in humiliating circumstances. He was credited with a liking for low society, vulgar pleasures, and studies which, in the opinion of society, were almost as unworthy of a Roman gentleman. To crown all, he was said to be weak and easily led by those nearest to him, his women and his freedmen.

This portrait of Claudius was probably in the main true to life. But we are shown another and somewhat different aspect of this Roman James I. The same authorities who dwell on his weakness and pedantry charge him with having been audacious enough to fling aside the venerated 'maxims of Augustus' and to initiate a new departure in the government of the empire. To the modern student it is sufficiently clear that in this matter Claudius gave proof of genuine statesmanship and showed himself capable of conceiving, carrying out, and, as his famous oration indicates, of defending a broad and liberal policy. It is equally clear that this policy was not only almost as completely at variance with 'Augustan maxims' as Gaius's extravagant claims to omnipotence, but that it wounded as deeply the susceptibilities of Roman society. Seneca, whether he is caricaturing Claudius for the benefit of Nero and his court, or putting into Nero's mouth a formal repudiation of his predecessor's methods, leaves us in no doubt as to the points on which hostile criticism fastened. Claudius was charged, in the first place, with endeavouring to ignore the division of labour established by Augustus, and to concentrate in himself the 'duties of senate, magistrates, and laws.' Secondly, he was accused of confounding the 'household of Cæsar' with the commonwealth of Rome, and of placing his freedmen 'on a level with himself and the laws.' Finally, in contrast with the wise parsimony of Augustus, he was said to have favoured so wide an extension of Roman citizenship that, if the fates had not cut short his career, not enough aliens would have been left to keep up the stock.

The first of these charges need not stay us. Claudius' taste for business, especially for judicial business, was as marked as the distaste shown by Nero, and the growing desire of the public to get their cases heard by Cæsar facilitated its gratification; but there is no indication in this direction of any new policy. It is otherwise with the second charge. It is now generally agreed among scholars that the principate of Claudius coincides with a marked development of what may be called Cæsar's own administrative service as distinct from the public service of the state. The status of at least his principal household officers, his secretary (*ab epistulis*), his controller of accounts (*a rationibus*), and his receiver of petitions (*a libellis*), was improved; and these private servants, though freedmen, were invested with the insignia of Roman magistrates. Similarly his revenue officers in the provinces (*procuratores*) received the most distinctive prerogative of public magistrates, jurisdiction. These measures could unquestionably be described as involving a confusion of the household with the commonwealth; and they were a departure from the policy of both Augustus and Tiberius. Nor did Claudius content himself with thus raising his private servants to the dignity of state officials. He also sensibly extended the area of their activity at the expense of the old magistracies of the commonwealth. To mention only a few instances, the duty of superintending the unloading of the cornships at Ostia, the care of the public lands in Cisalpine Gaul and of the grazing-grounds in south Italy, were all transferred from quæstors to imperial officers; while, in the charge of the water-supply of Rome, the senatorial commissioner was replaced by a procurator of Cæsar.

This policy cannot be dismissed as due simply either to Claudius' love of meddling or to the influence of his freedmen. It was an attempt to deal with a genuine administrative difficulty. The Augustan partnership in administration between Cæsar and the magistrates of the state was fast breaking down owing to the inefficiency of the latter. Alike in Italy and in the provinces, the difference between the departments administered by Cæsar's officers and the rest was unmistakable. But, though the extension of the sphere assigned to Cæsar promoted efficiency, it meant, as things stood, the increased prominence and activity of the 'household;'

it involved, in short, 'palace government.' For, if we except the legates who ruled Cæsar's provinces or commanded his legions, the bulk of the officials who carried on his government were not, in the eye of the law, officials at all, but private servants, often freedmen, or, at the best, Roman knights. The fact was not only a source of weakness to Cæsar, but a standing offence to Roman society, in whose eyes the ability of those low-born agents, and the importance of the duties which they discharged, were no excuse for their undue prominence and influence. Two centuries later, when Cæsar's service had lost this domestic and private character, the greatest nobles were ready to fill the 'officia palatina,' the offices in the household. For this change the time was not yet come, but Claudius undoubtedly prepared the way for it by investing these posts, even while held by freedmen, with something of the dignity of magistracies of state.

As to the last of the charges brought against Claudius, that of indiscriminate lavishness in granting Roman citizenship, we are inclined to think that both Dio Cassius and modern historians have taken the language of Seneca's famous satire too literally. Neither Tacitus nor Suetonius, it should be noticed, supports the charge. The extant fragments of Claudius' speech on the admission of the Gaulish chiefs to senatorial dignity do indeed prove that he was in favour of that liberal policy of comprehension, which, as he argues, had been the policy pursued by Rome from quite early days, and pursued with the best results; but in this case there was no question of granting citizenship, for the Gaulish chiefs already possessed it. Nor is it safe to assume that his undoubted activity in founding colonies, or in creating Roman 'municipia' in the provinces, involved any large addition to the numbers of citizens. On the other hand, there is no evidence of any grant of citizenship or even of Latin rights by Claudius on a large scale. As a possible explanation of Seneca's language, we would suggest that it merely gives exaggerated expression to the resentment felt in Roman society at Claudius' partiality for the Gaulish chiefs, whose countryman he was by birth, who had loved and honoured his father, and who were bound by many ties to the Cæsars, whose name they bore. Claudius, says Seneca, was a Gaul; it was

natural that under him the Gauls should capture Rome. But this peaceful invasion of Rome by Gauls was as unpopular as that of England by the Scots under James I, or, at a later period, under Lord Bute. There was, as Claudius implicitly allows, this amount of reason in the prejudice, that the chiefs, to whom seats in the senate and the honours of consulship or prætorship were now granted, as little resembled the peaceful burghers from the Romanised towns of southern Gaul or Spain as Fergus MacIvor did Bailie Nicol Jarvie. They were still the hereditary rulers of strong and warlike clans; they were wealthy; and, above all, it was they and their clansmen who, side by side with the legions, kept guard on the banks of the Rhine against the Germans.

We must pass to the emperor with whom, as Suetonius says, 'the progeny of the Cæsars ended.' The principate of Nero has left a more indelible mark on tradition than that of any of his predecessors, for in his case the hatred of Christians for the first persecutor of the Church has combined with the denunciations of pagan authors to keep his portrait fresh and vivid. The lurid reflection of the flames which consumed half Rome has coloured all the accounts of his reign, and has, it may be suggested, even tinged those of the Cæsars who preceded him. We are therefore entirely at one with Mr Henderson when he urges that in judging Nero it is even more essential than in the case of his predecessors to take into account the rather distorted medium through which the writers of the second century viewed him. We may dismiss the idea that he was a madman. We are justified in disbelieving, as Tacitus probably disbelieved, the story that he fiddled while Rome was burning. We may agree both with Mr Henderson and Professor Dill in recognising that Nero had good impulses, that he could and did inspire affection. He was certainly not destitute of ability, and he had a real if somewhat misdirected love of art. Nor had he any of the defects which made Claudius ridiculous, or the cynical contempt for human life, and the serene belief in his own omnipotence, which distinguished Gaius. But he followed where his passions led him, whether the ruling passion for the moment was lust or extravagance or, as it often was, fear; and once launched on this career he knew no scruples. That he

may have inherited from his paternal ancestors, the Domitii, a vein of ferocity is possible; but he lacked the stern courage and resolution characteristic of them and, still more, of his mother, Agrippina.

It is just because Nero was above all things the slave of uncontrolled impulse and passion that we find it difficult to follow Mr Henderson in his attempt to credit him with statesmanship and a rational policy in public affairs. That he liked applause, that he could be generous, and that his fancy was at times caught by visions of universal benevolence or universal conquest, may be admitted. But the evidence which justifies us in applying the term statesman to Tiberius or Claudius is wanting in the case of Nero. Thanks to Seneca and Burrus, and by contrast with what followed, the first five years of his principate, the 'quinquennium aureum,' were years of quiet and good order. But it was only on the surface that there was any reaction against the Claudian policy or any return to the maxims of Augustus. Nero disliked affairs as much as Claudius loved them, and so far the senate and magistrates had freer play; but both senate and consuls were as much afraid as ever of acting without the imperial knowledge and approval. Nor will Nero's achievements in the way of domestic or economic reform bear the emphasis which Mr Henderson lays upon them. We have a grandiose scheme on paper for a canal, and a momentary fancy of abolishing indirect taxation, both characteristically Neronian; when we have added the settlements of veterans at one or two decaying towns in Italy, a harbour at Antium, intended probably mainly for the convenience of the imperial palace, and a few more privileges granted to the corn merchants, we have virtually completed a list which compares badly with the Claudian harbour at Ostia, the Claudian aqueducts, the two roads which opened up the inland valleys of the central Apennines, and the draining of the Fucine lake. Abroad, the most important achievement of his principate was the settlement of the Armenian question on a rational basis; but this was the work, not of Nero and his advisers in Rome, who did their best to prevent it, but of Corbulo. Of Nero's visionary schemes for further eastern conquest, we have only space to say that we cannot take them so seriously as Mr Henderson appears to do.

That matters on the whole went well in the provinces and on the frontiers is true; and the fact, while not proving Nero to have been a wise ruler, illustrates what is perhaps the most characteristic anomaly in the political situation throughout this period. On the frontiers and in their own provinces the Cæsars of the first century were openly and formally recognised as supreme by the original constitution of the principate. Here there were no irritating constitutional fictions to be respected, no colleagues equally jealous and timorous to be conciliated or ignored, and here the senate could only step in if Cæsar himself invited it to do so. But, if Cæsar's authority abroad could be frankly displayed and openly exercised, any tendency to a capricious use of it was checked, and the results of incompetency in Cæsar himself were partially neutralised, by a solid framework of official tradition, in parts as old as Augustus, in parts older still, which steadied the administration on the frontiers, in the camps, in provincial chanceries, and gave to the foreign policy and the provincial government of the Cæsars its remarkable continuity.

It was otherwise in Rome. On the one hand, under the Augustan constitution, Cæsar was only one of several authorities whose prerogatives he was bound to respect, and on whose departments he was not to encroach. In the administration of justice there were tribunals of equal rank with his own from whose decisions no appeal lay to himself. He was, moreover, confronted with a wealthy aristocracy, nervously alive to every indication of a tendency on his part to overstep his appointed limits. On the other hand, there was the general consciousness that this division of labour and these limitations were fictitious, and that in the background, but near at hand, were the prætorian cohorts. The fact of this unacknowledged, irregular, but very real, power dominated the situation in Rome; it paralysed the courage and excited the secret resentment of Cæsar's colleagues, of the senate and the nobles, while few Cæsars, even though they did not, like Gaius, cast all disguise to the wind, could resist the temptation of exercising their power when irritated by opposition or alarmed by fears of treachery. Nor is it surprising that, when exercised under these conditions, it was exercised capriciously and cruelly.

A word must lastly be said of the man who has divided with Nero the interest and attention of posterity. Opinions differed as to Seneca's character and merits even among his younger contemporaries. That we have not yet arrived at a general agreement is clear from the judgments passed upon him by Mr Henderson and Professor Dill; and we must confess that with neither of these judgments are we in complete accord. Professor Dill's view of Seneca is sufficiently indicated by the title of the chapter which he has devoted to him, 'The Philosophic Director.' Seneca, in Mr Dill's eyes, is a 'pagan monk,' a 'saviour of souls,' conscious of an 'evangelistic mission.' Such phrases seem to us inconsistent with the whole tone and temper both of Seneca himself and of his age; they overlook the difference which separated both from the Antonine period—a difference which went deeper than the change in literary taste which caused Seneca's full-blooded and rather florid style to turn the stomachs of Tacitus and even of Quintilian. Seneca has much of what we are accustomed to call the 'eighteenth century' temper, and little or nothing of the detachment from practical life and the mysticism of the later philosophic missionaries and theologians with whom Professor Dill seems inclined to class him.

Mr Henderson's portrait of Seneca strikes us as truer to life; our quarrel with him is that he lays too much stress on Seneca as a philosopher, and consequently on the inconsistency of much in his way of life with his philosophic pretensions. The truth, so we are inclined to think, is that Seneca has been unfortunate in more ways than one. In the eyes of the writers of the next two generations he was part of a régime which had passed away, with its exuberant vitality, its excesses, its splendours and its crimes. Tacitus's generation was all for simplicity and severity, alike in habits of life and in literary style. They looked back, where Seneca's contemporaries looked forward; they lived in a quieter, safer, but also a more prosaic present. Therefore, as orator and writer, Seneca went out of fashion. A second misfortune for Seneca was the manner of his death. The circumstances attending it gave him a place on the roll of stoic martyrs, and labelled him philosopher for all time. The inevitable consequence was to draw attention

to the many points in which he fell lamentably short of the philosophic ideal as understood in the second century. These supposed inconsistencies became naturally a favourite theme with his depreciators, and they have influenced opinion about him ever since. Even the close relationship in which he stood to Nero was judged in the light of Nero's later excesses and crimes.

Yet a careful reading of Tacitus and of Quintilian makes it clear that it was not as a philosopher that Seneca won his fame. It was for his learning that he was chosen to be Nero's tutor by Agrippina, who shared the view held by Seneca's own mother, and by the mother of Agricola, that philosophy was a thing of which a Roman gentleman might easily have too much. To the elder Pliny, an encyclopædist himself, Seneca is the 'prince of scholars.' Quintilian praises his wide and varied knowledge, but adds, 'he was no great student (*diligens*) of philosophy.' It was, in short, as an erudite scholar that he was pre-eminent. With his erudition went, as we learn, a singular facility of speech and a courtly urbanity of manner, neither of them attributes characteristic of the professed philosopher. In spite of his wealth and the splendour of his surroundings, his personal habits were simple; but the simplicity was far more probably due to the 'provincial frugality' of his Spanish home than to any deliberate asceticism. He was no dreamer or mystic, but a shrewd and successful man of business. In his writings he moralises gracefully, if at somewhat wearisome length; but he is most at home when curiously enquiring into natural phenomena, the origin of the Nile flood, or the causes of earthquakes.

If we dismiss the claim put forward on his behalf, mostly by later writers, to rank as a professor of philosophy, we may also dismiss many of the worst charges brought against his private life and conduct. He was vain, as scholars have been before and since; he was a courtier; but in paying court even to powerful freedmen he did not stand alone, as the tales of Vespasian prove. The grosser accusations against him rest mainly on the well-known denunciation of his life and character in Dio; but in this passage, as a comparison with Tacitus shows, Dio or his epitomator merely reproduces the bitter invectives hurled at Seneca by the informer Suillius.

Seneca, as he appears to us, was neither a confessor administering consolation to souls in distress, nor a professing philosopher whose philosophy was artificial, and whose private life was unworthy of his profession. He was a man of learning and letters, pre-eminent in his generation for varied knowledge and ready speech, and sharing with his contemporaries their somewhat florid tastes and their want of interest in antiquity; he was kindly and courteous, sometimes to excess; he loved money, and was a shrewd man of business; but he retained also other qualities even more characteristic of the provincial *bourgeois*, simplicity of life and strong family affections. Fate, or the good judgment of Agrippina, gave him a colleague, a provincial like himself, Afranius Burrus, bred, as the Vaison inscription has told us, a soldier, then, for at least twenty years, a trusted agent in the household of the Cæsars, and finally promoted to the prefecture of the prætorium. With Burrus his alliance was close and unbroken—'a rare thing,' remarks Tacitus, 'between colleagues in power'—and together for five years they directed the policy of the state and held in some check the wild impulses of Nero.

H. F. PELHAM.

Art. X.—PREFERENCE: THE COLONIAL VIEW.*

1. *Papers relating to Resolutions passed by Colonial Legislatures since 1890 in favour of Preferential Trade relations with the United Kingdom*, 1905. [Cd. 2326.]
2. *Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal Party*. By J. S. Willison. Two vols. Toronto: Morang, 1903.
3. *Protection in Canada and Australasia*. By C. H. Chomley. London: King, 1904.
4. *Canada and the Empire*. By Edwin S. Montagu and Bron Herbert. With a preface by Lord Rosebery. London: King, 1904.

I. CANADA.

THE books mentioned above deserve a fuller treatment than we have at present space to give. The life of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is, in effect, an admirably written history of public life in Canada for the last quarter of a century. The commanding position which the Prime Minister has attained in his own country, and the eminence which he enjoys here and abroad, are of themselves evidence of a high personal character and of a great genius for public affairs. Mr Chomley's book, not the least useful of a useful series, gives a concise account of the origin, growth, and consequences of Protection in our great self-governing dependencies, and includes a chapter on preferential trade. The little work by which Mr Montagu and Mr Herbert have enlightened the fiscal controversy contains in a small space a curious and valuable contribution of Canadian opinion, gathered in personal interviews, by correspondence, and by travel. It is with the questions discussed by these authors that we propose to deal.

The mental attitude of Canada towards the scheme of preferential trade is not so easily defined as many public men and many daily papers would have us believe. 'It is the duty of the newspapers,' said Bishop Creighton, 'to tell us what to do; it is our duty not to do it. If things were as simple as our critics make them out, we should have done what they advise long ago.' If Canadian opinion were so perfectly clear as many people assert, there would be no room for differences of opinion. Such differ-

* These articles are by residents in Canada and Australia respectively. ;

ences do exist, and are stated with some degree of vehemence by people of sufficient character and intelligence to save them from the suspicion of stupidity or falsehood. It will be useful to treat the subject first of all historically, and to show how public opinion has expressed itself at various periods. The popular will is most surely to be found in customs laws, orders-in-council, parliamentary decisions, and the public declarations of ministers. Let us see what opinion these oracles indicate.

The tariff history of Canada began even before the acquisition of responsible government in 1847. The idea of Protection was not absent at even that early period. Each province maintained a tariff against all the others. That of Nova Scotia was called a 10 per cent tariff; that of New Brunswick was 12½; that of Prince Edward Island was 11 per cent. There were also different currencies in each; and between the tariffs and the currencies the difficulties in the way of doing business were many and great. These difficulties, indeed, in addition to internal political dead-lock and external pressure in the form of Fenian invasion, combined to bring about federation in 1867. It was the tariff of the united province of Canada (Upper and Lower) which influenced fiscal legislation before that date, and formed the basis of it subsequently. Little interested in manufactures, the maritime provinces were in favour of Free Trade; but little by little manufacturing industry arose; and, in order to conserve the West India trade, to encourage coal production and to promote sugar refining, as well as to foster various small industries, the policy of Protection found favour.

It was in Upper Canada, united by the Act of 1841, that the first protective and preferential tariff was adopted. In 1842 the legislature passed an Act which has a curious bearing on the Dominion preference legislation of 1897. This Act put a duty of 3s. per quarter on wheat imported into Canada from the United States. It was passed

'in the confident belief and expectation that, upon the imposition of a duty upon foreign wheat imported into the province, her Majesty will be graciously pleased to recommend to Parliament the removal or reduction of the duties on wheat and wheat-flour imported into the said United Kingdom from Canada.'

This was the first offer of preference. The Governor reserved the Act for the consideration of the home authorities; and, after due consideration, it was allowed. By chapter 29 of the Imperial Acts of 1843 the duty on wheat from Canada was reduced to 1s. per quarter, and on wheat-flour in due proportion. It was not stipulated that the wheat should be grown in Canada. Had that been done, the subsequent results would not have been so disastrous. The immediate effect of the Act was the investment of a large part of the available capital of Canada in mills, the importation of great quantities of wheat from the United States for grinding, and a large expenditure on improving the means of transport—all on the faith of the continuance of the policy of preference.

In 1846 all this artificial and precarious business was destroyed by the free-trade legislation of the time. The Colonies were not altogether without warning. The official correspondence of the time shows that on January 28, 1846, a remonstrance was sent to Mr Gladstone, then Under-secretary for the Colonies, from the Executive Council of Canada. The evils of a change in the corn laws were set forth. The enlarging of the canals had been undertaken on the good faith of the Act of 1843. The tolls on the canals would now fail, and the St Lawrence route would be ruined. The means of paying the interest on the debt incurred would be taken away; and England would have to pay the interest she had guaranteed. The shipping interest would be injured; the forwarding trade destroyed; the importations of British goods would be lessened. Mr Gladstone exerted his fullest powers in reply to show the Canadian Government that on every point they had raised they were economically wrong. The Canadians were not convinced. They protested and petitioned. Protests were ignored and petitions were in vain. Mr Gladstone offered cheerful advice and a high strain of lofty consolation, but no Protection and especially no Preference. His despatch of June 3, 1846 (Commons Papers, 1846, vol. 27), was his supreme effort of argumentative reply. Among other things it contained a peremptory rejection of all further preferences such as were offered and accepted in 1842-3.

'It would' (he said) 'be a source of the greatest pain to her Majesty's Government if they could share in the impression

that the connexion between this country and Canada derived its vitality from no other source than from the exchange of commercial preferences. If it were so, it might appear to be a relation consisting in the exchange not of benefits but of burdens; if it were so, it would suggest the idea that the connexion itself had reached, or was about to reach, the legitimate term of its existence. But her Majesty's Government still augur for it a longer duration founded upon a larger and firmer basis,' etc.

There may be something in the advice thus tendered that is worth consideration at present. The high temper of the controversy at the time, and in the years which followed, arose out of the result of an economical experiment which failed. The omen is not obscure.

From 1846 the policy of Canada began to precipitate itself rapidly towards avowed Protection. Meetings were held to advocate it, and resolutions were passed by large majorities. The unfortunate events of 1849 which so disturbed the career of Lord Elgin, following on the bankruptcy and distress caused by the failure of the preferential policy, turned the minds of many men towards the United States, where the benefits of Protection were alleged to be obvious. In 1854, however, another change took place. The Reciprocity treaty of that year, negotiated by Lord Elgin, brought about a new state of things, including discrimination against Great Britain. Reciprocal trade continued with the United States for thirteen years. On the whole, it is now generally admitted that the balance of advantage was with the United States. The prosperity of Canada from 1854 to 1866, when the treaty was petulantly abrogated by the United States, was largely due to the demands created by the war in the Crimea and the American Civil War. Had these events not occurred, the natural operation of the treaty would probably have been observed to be of doubtful commercial value. Politically it might have prevented the formation of the Dominion.

Even the Reciprocity treaty did not prevent a short period of depression. The year 1857 was an unfortunate one for Canada. The harvest failed, alike in Canada and in the United States. Canada was caught by the disaster in a state of extravagant over-expenditure, public and private. A general bankruptcy took place. The public

revenue fell off. It was necessary to provide means for carrying on the government. The tariff of 1858 was the experiment adopted. It was frankly protective, so far as the terms of the Reciprocity treaty permitted. The introduction of this tariff marks a stage in colonial constitutional government. The Governor sent home the tariff for consideration. Manufacturers in England protested against its protective provisions. The Duke of Newcastle expressed in a despatch (Commons Papers, 1864, vol. 41, p. 79) his agreement with the manufacturers, and allowed a hint to escape him as to disallowance. Upon this, Mr (afterwards Sir Alexander) Galt, on behalf of the Government of Canada, peremptorily reminded the British minister that Canada was the sole judge of its own fiscal necessities, and warned him that he must not interfere unless he were 'prepared to assume the administration of the affairs of the colony irrespective of the views of its inhabitants.' This despatch has long been looked on as a Declaration of Right in regard to customs laws in Canada.

The tariff of 1858 was in force till 1866, when, in view of the abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty and the approaching federation of all the provinces, a compromise tariff was prepared for the purpose of conciliating the various opinions that prevailed. A general rate of 15 per cent. was adopted on unenumerated articles; and the protective character of the tariff was maintained. This measure was adopted in 1868 by the Federal Parliament. In 1873 there was a change of government; and from that year to 1878 there was a constantly growing demand for Protection. The new Government so far yielded as to increase the tariff to 17½ per cent., but felt itself unable to concede more. The Opposition formulated year after year, from 1876, a policy of Protection. In 1878 the Government was beaten; and a new Ministry, under Sir John Macdonald, came into power. It was pledged to Protection, and to retaliation on the United States, with the view of forcing that country to adopt a reciprocal policy. The tariff of 1879 was protective in a high degree, and was called the National Policy. Under this tariff, with various changes, sometimes by way of reduction, sometimes by way of increase or readjustment, the country worked till the year 1896. In

1891 there had been a slight decrease; in 1894 further reductions were made; but the protective principle was kept in view. Indeed the reductions were made on the ground that the principle had been a success.

In 1896 there was again a change of government; and, though the economic question had not been the chief topic of discussion, the tariff was necessarily an important question for the new government. The result of elaborate investigations by ministers was the tariff of 1897, by which the preference offer was freely made, and the whole tariff readjusted; but the protective principle remained untouched. The demand for higher protection, loudly uttered by many candidates during the general election of 1904, was not accepted by the constituencies. A demand was made by a deputation of importers in January 1905 for a further reduction on manufactured imports; but, as the Prime Minister said, the demand was unique; more protection, not less, was the usual cry. In February the makers of felt unanimously demanded more protection, especially against British manufacturers. The makers of woollens have declared for a year past that without more protection they must be ruined. But the desire for reciprocity with the United States has been generally abandoned; and that element of uncertainty may be considered as removed, at least for the present, though it can never be wholly absent. The tariff, with its preference clause in favour of Great Britain and the Colonies and India, its German surtax, and its revised dumping clause, is now complete. And there the matter stands.

Now let us see how the preferential offer and the Preferential Act bear upon the situation in Great Britain. The offer was not made, ostensibly at least, as the offer in the tariff of 1842-3 was made, with an avowed intention of producing a return of preferential advantages in the British market. It was, as Sir Wilfrid Laurier told us in 1897, a free gift, to show loyalty and to exhibit a willingness to discuss at least a wider and more imperial scheme. The Opposition in Canada condemned the offer as having been needlessly made without any condition of reciprocal advantages. An aggressive party in Great Britain, ably led, is now demanding a reciprocal policy. What hope is there, under present conditions, that such

reciprocal policy can be framed, or that, if framed, it will be accepted in Great Britain or in Canada? Let us define the situation in both countries.

In the case of Canada, we have a country committed since 1858 to a constantly increasing policy of high Protection for a vast number of industries. There is no possible hope that this policy will be modified to such an extent as would beneficially affect the manufacturing industries of Great Britain. No legislation has been proposed, no promise made, that would lead us to indulge in that delusive dream. The preference of 1897 still leaves Canada with heavy customs duties against every article of manufactures imported from Great Britain; that point is not always fully understood. The percentage of duty collected on dutiable imports into Canada since 1897, the year of the preferential offer, is as follows:—

1897	\$19,891,996	77	..	26·8	per cent.
1898	22,157,788	49	..	27·3	"
1899	25,784,228	75	..	26·2	"
1900	28,899,110	13	..	25·5	"
1901	29,106,979	80	..	25·2	"
1902	32,425,532	31	..	25·3	"
1903	37,110,354	59	..	25·8	"
1904	40,954,349	14	..	26·2	"

That is still a pretty stiff tariff with which Canada has to deal in giving preference in these markets. That Canada will materially reduce it is beyond all present hope.

The rise and progress of the demand for a general scheme of Imperial preference has never, so far as we know, been chronologically narrated. It began at the colonial conference of 1887, though, by consent, no special resolution was then passed. Mr Hofmeyr, representing the Cape of Good Hope, brought forward this proposition:—

‘Whether it should not be recognised, as part of the duty of the governing bodies of the Empire, to see that their own subjects have a preference over foreign subjects in matters of trade.’

He urged this proposal by arguments which have been since adopted by public speakers who have not been too fastidious as to the morality of inverted commas. We hear these arguments from the platform; we read them in the press; and we find ourselves murmuring, ‘Who

ished the murex up? What porridge had John Keats? Mr Hofmeyr's repertory has been robbed by people who used to shout Free Trade when he was whispering Protection, but who are now enthusiastically redelivering his speeches in fragments, and then binding them in volumes for somewhat piratical distribution. The celerity of their conversion is remarkable. Their ingratitude is obvious, but perhaps not remarkable.

The question was again raised at the colonial conference at Ottawa in 1894. A resolution was moved by the Hon. G. E. Foster, then Finance Minister, as follows:—

'That this conference records its belief in the advisability of a customs arrangement between Great Britain and her Colonies, by which trade within the Empire may be placed on a more favourable footing than that which is carried on with foreign countries.'

This resolution was carried on a vote as follows: for the resolution, Canada, Tasmania, Cape of Good Hope, South Australia, Victoria—5; against it, New South Wales, New Zealand, Queensland—3. Since that time all the governments represented have undergone changes; the whole political situation has altered.

In 1897 the question was again brought before a colonial conference, at which the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

1. 'That the Premiers of the self-governing Colonies unanimously and earnestly recommend the denunciation, at the earliest convenient time, of any treaties which now hamper the commercial relations between Great Britain and her Colonies.'

2. 'That in the hope of improving the trade relations between the mother-country and the Colonies, the Premiers present undertake to confer with their colleagues with the view to seeing whether such a result can be properly secured by a preference given by the Colonies to the products of the United Kingdom.'

Under the first of these resolutions the two treaties with the German Zollverein and Belgium, against which Canada had several times protested, were terminated. Under the second the preferential offer of Canada was enlarged in 1898. But on the question of general mutual Preference

no resolution was passed; and Mr Chamberlain indicated its difficulty as follows:—

‘Undoubtedly the fiscal arrangements of the different Colonies differ so much among themselves, and all differ so much from those of the mother-country, that it would be a matter of the greatest complication and difficulty to arrive at any conclusion which would unite us commercially in the same sense in which the Zollverein united the Empire of Germany.’

The Canadian parliamentary history of the resolutions in favour of a general scheme of Preference is far from satisfactory. In 1892 Mr McNeil moved a resolution,

‘That if and when the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland admits Canadian products to the markets of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than it accords to the products of foreign countries, the Parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages by a substantial reduction in the duties it imposes upon British manufactured goods.’

This resolution, having the support of the Ministry, was passed. An amendment asking for an immediate reduction of duties on British goods, in view of the fact that the British market was free already, was voted down. In 1893 a resolution in favour of reciprocal trade with all nations willing to make concessions was similarly rejected. In 1897 and 1898 came the new Ministry's offer of Preference without conditions. In 1899 a motion asking Canada to respond to advances from leading British statesmen for preferential relations was negatived. In 1900 a similar motion met with the same fate, though a motion approving of Canada's unconditional Preference was accepted. In 1901 the leader of the Opposition moved for more protection at home and for a preferential policy with Great Britain. The motion was rejected. In 1902 he repeated his motion with no better result. In 1903 his motion was a third time negatived. In 1904 he abandoned the preferential policy, but moved for more ‘adequate protection.’ This also was defeated.

We remark (1) that all the resolutions in favour of general preferential trade, save that of 1892, have been rejected by Parliament; (2) that all the men who proposed them lost their seats in Parliament; (3) that the

party which gave them its support has been defeated at three general elections, in 1896, 1900, and 1904; (4) that at the recent general election (Nov. 3, 1904) the question of preferential trade occupied a very inconspicuous place in platform discussions; (5) that the ministers who concede that they are, like their opponents, theoretically in favour of the policy, have yet decided to take no further steps till the general election in Great Britain is over, and the British Government is in a position to make advances of a practical kind.

That this is so we have proof enough in the Budget speech of the Hon. W. S. Fielding, the Finance Minister, who, on June 7, 1904, in the Canadian House of Commons, was sufficiently explicit. Referring to the relations of the two parties in Canada on the question he said:—

‘We may differ in detail, but I think I am justified in saying . . . that practically the two great political parties in Canada are a unit to-day in favour of the principle of preferential trade. Though they may differ as to particular items of detail, or as to the best method of bringing it about, there is practically no difference in Canada.’

But with regard to the attitude of the Ministry of Canada he continued as follows:—

‘It has been sometimes said that Canada should take some further action in endorsing that principle. I do not think we are called upon to take any step beyond that which we have already taken. The attitude of Canada has been clearly laid down at the colonial conference; and, while every phase of the government policy has been discussed in this House, there has been practically no exception taken to the position assumed by the Government at that conference on the question of preferential trade. Now that the matter has become one of party controversy in England, we naturally hesitate to take an active part in it.’

Nothing can be clearer than these emphatic declarations. Nor is Mr Fielding alone in this announcement of policy. Tariff questions in Canada seem to be left usually in the hands of the Minister of Finance. The Prime Minister, however, has not been reticent on the question. In winding up the Budget debate on June 14, 1904, he said:—

‘We did not imitate any other nation; we were the originators. We adopted a policy which we thought suited to our

condition, both as a colony and a young nation, believing it to be in accord with sound economic conditions. We adopted a policy which we thought would advance Canadian trade with Great Britain, our mother-country, and which would at the same time afford considerable relief to the Canadian consumer. A year ago we imposed the German surtax. In doing so we did not borrow legislation from other countries; we devised a remedy which we had reason to believe would compel a powerful nation to give us the fair treatment which that nation denied us, or, at all events, would force him to respect us. This year again, in order to meet a modern evil which has resulted from new methods in highly protected countries, we have invented a policy which we have every reason to believe will prove entirely effectual. As it was in the past, so it shall be in the future; we shall face any difficulties, we shall face any problems, as they arise, and we shall endeavour to settle them by ways and means altogether Canadian in their conception, altogether Canadian in their character.'

Nor was this his last utterance on the subject. At Sorel, on September 28, 1904, just before the general election, he made an eloquent general declaration of his policy and concluded thus:—

'Are you going to continue that policy? On that point the answer is easy. It has been before the country for two years. It was given, not in Ottawa or in Canada, but in the heart of the Empire at London, at the colonial conference, when I declared to the Empire that I and my colleagues of the Government were ready to make a trade treaty. We said, "We are ready to discuss with you articles on which we can give you a preference and articles on which you can give us a preference. We are ready to make with you a treaty of trade." Mark those words coming from a colony to the mother-country without offence being given or taken. What stronger proof could you want of the immense development we have made in our legislative independence when we say to the British Government we are ready to negotiate with them? There is the most complete vindication, not only of our Government, but of the tolerance of the British Government in its relations with the Colonies.'

The views of the Prime Minister are quite in accord with those of the Finance Minister. They both indicate clearly that nothing more can be expected from Canada till Great

Britain is in a position to treat. In the meantime the advocates of the preferential policy are looking, in Great Britain, for advances from the Colonies, while endeavouring by means of Blue-books to prove, not very successfully, that the advances have been made. The situation has a humorous side which has a historical precedent—

'The Earl of Chatham, with sword drawn,
Stood waiting for Sir Richard Strachan;
Sir Richard, longing to be at 'em,
Stood waiting for the Earl of Chatham.'

The Blue-book (Cd. 2326, 1904) which has been put forward, as we have said, to prove that the Colonies are very much in earnest on the subject of preferential trade, is not a convincing document: it requires explanation. The first resolution quoted is that of 1892, to which we have already referred (p. 6). That resolution was voted against by all who now remain in public life of the party then in opposition and now in power. It was passed by the party which is now in the minority. Its authority as a measure of public opinion is therefore small. The second resolution, to which also we have referred (p. 6), is that which was passed in 1900. It runs as follows:—

'This House regards the principle of British preference in the Canadian customs tariff as one which, in its application, has already resulted, and will, in an increasing measure, continue to result, in material benefit to the mother-country and to Canada, and which has already aided in welding, and must still more firmly weld, together the ties which now bind them, and desires to express its emphatic approval of such British preference having been granted by the Parliament of Canada.'

This was voted against by all who remained in public life of the party which passed the resolution of 1892. It was, however, carried by 91 votes to 46. It simply represents the opinion of the dominant party in favour of the unconditional preference of 1897-8, and has no reference at all to the general scheme of mutual preference within the Empire. That this is so is proved by the fact that, in the same session, the following resolution was rejected by a vote of 88 to 48:—

'That this House is of opinion that a system of mutual trade preference between Great Britain and Ireland and the Colonies

would greatly stimulate increased production in and commerce between those countries, and would thus promote and maintain the unity of the Empire; and that no measure of preference which falls short of the complete realisation of such a policy should be considered final or satisfactory.'

It will thus appear that parliamentary opinion in Canada on this subject is still an uncertain quantity. The resolutions given in the Blue-book, as passed in the provincial legislatures, require similar explanation. They can hardly be considered valuable. That of Manitoba is as follows:—

'This House strongly commends and endorses the policy advocated by the Right Honourable Joseph Chamberlain, involving certain fiscal changes within the Empire, and is of the opinion that the inauguration and putting into practical effect of such policy would be of paramount importance and benefit to the people of Manitoba.'

It is necessary to explain that an amendment to the above was moved in the following terms:—

'That the people of Canada, to assist in the successful carrying out of this policy, should be prepared to make such further substantial reductions in the Canadian tariff against British goods as shall ensure to the British manufacturers an enlarged market in Canada in return for a preference by Great Britain upon Canadian food products.'

This amendment was rejected; and its rejection is evidence of the fact that any further substantial reduction of the Canadian tariff is not contemplated nor desired, even in the corn-producing province of Manitoba. In conclusion, we may point out that there are no resolutions from Ontario, nor from Quebec, nor from Nova Scotia, nor from British Columbia. We may therefore put the other provinces aside.

The most authoritative opinion from non-official sources which has been expressed on the subject was that of the general meeting of Chambers of Commerce of the Empire which took place at Montreal.

The resolution then passed, after much discussion and some amendment, was as follows:—

'It is resolved that, in the opinion of this congress, the bonds of the British Empire shall be materially strengthened, and a union of the various parts of his Majesty's dominions greatly consolidated, by the adoption of a commercial policy based upon the principle of mutual benefit, whereby each component part of the Empire would receive a substantial advantage in trade as the result of its national relationship, *due consideration being given to the fiscal and industrial needs of the component parts of the Empire*; and that this congress urges upon his Majesty's Government the appointment by them of a special commission, composed of representatives of Great Britain and her Colonies and India, to consider the possibility of thus increasing and strengthening the trade relations between the different parts of the Empire and the trading facilities within the Empire and with foreign countries.'

In this resolution we find the characteristic weaknesses of the whole case—(1) the assumption that somehow the welfare and unity of this Empire depend upon a new fiscal policy; (2) that this new fiscal policy must in no way threaten any of the present or prospective interests of the Colonies or limit their right to protect their own industries; (3) that a new conference—all the others having failed—is the way to arrive at finality. The most casual reader will see, when he examines the resolution, that, if the new policy is not adopted, this Empire will probably not perish; that a policy, the permanence of which must always depend on the reserved right of the Colonies, and of Great Britain, to alter their own tariffs to suit circumstances, is not likely to be stable; and that a new conference, to which all the members will come fettered by local jealousy, local interests, and local political exigencies, will end as the others have ended, in Blue-books and bathos.

What are the practical results, so far, of the measure of Preference accorded by Canada? That they are in dispute, alike in Canada and in Great Britain, is natural enough, since, in both countries alike, they are in the arena of politics, and it is not easy to disentangle what is economic from what is political in the figures and arguments presented. The statistics are, to some extent, rendered of doubtful value by the fact that, from 1892 to 1896, there was a period of depression in Canadian

trade, and that from 1897 to the present date there has been a period of unusual activity due to the opening up of the Yukon territory, the rapid extension of railways, the great increase in population, and the liberal expenditure of public revenue by an energetic government. It follows that the conditions for a comparison of trade figures over long periods, such as we find in the Colonial Office memorandum and the Canadian reply in the report of the colonial conference of 1902 (Cd. 1299, 1902), are not normal. But the conditions during the period from 1897 to 1904 offer a fair basis for deduction from the figures given in the Blue-books. The following tables give us a fairly clear idea of the course of trade during these six years and of the general effect of the preference given by Canada:—

—	1897.	1904.	Increase.
	\$	\$	\$
Canadian Exports to Great Britain	77,227,502	117,501,376	40,303,874
Canadian Exports to United States	40,373,472	72,772,932	23,309,460
Canadian Imports from Great Britain	29,412,188	61,777,574	32,365,386
Canadian Imports from United States	61,649,041	150,826,515	89,177,474

—	Great Britain.	United States.	Balance in favour of U.S.
	1897.	1897.	1897.
Canadian Imports free of duty before and since the Preference	\$16,236,341	31,231,524	14,945,183
	1904.	1904.	1904.
	\$16,792,602	74,061,271	57,268,570

	<i>Exports.</i>		
	1902.	1904.	Decrease.
Canadian trade with Germany before and since the Surtax	\$2,692,578	1,819,223	873,355
	<i>Imports.</i>		
	1902.	1904.	
	\$10,823,160	8,175,604	2,647,556
	<i>Exports.</i>		
	1897.	1904.	Increase.
Canadian trade with West Indies before and since the Preference	\$2,643,360	3,583,475	940,115
	<i>Imports.</i>		
	1897.	1904.	
	\$1,678,870	4,813,815	3,134,945

	General Tariff.	
	1904.	Duty.
Imports from Great Britain under General and Preferential Tariffs and Surtax	\$5,781,301	\$3,094,910
	Preferential Tariff.	
	38,475,505	7,454,733
	Surtax.	
	683,023	288,373
	44,939,829 total dutiable	\$10,838,016 total duty
	16,837,745 free goods	
	\$61,777,574 total	

From these tables it seems to be clear that while, so far as regards British trade with Canada, the results of the preferential policy have been successful, as regards Germany and the West Indies Great Britain has no special cause for rejoicing. She has shared, indeed, in the expanding trade of Canada; but the United States have shared much more largely. She has, indeed, the one substantial advantage of one third off the duty collected under the Preference clause (\$7,454,733); but whether this advantage is sufficient to justify her in altering the conditions on which a trade of more than 903,000,000*l.* sterling with all the world is conducted, is a point about which it is impossible to entertain any doubt.

That any further reduction of the customs duties of Canada on the manufactures of Great Britain can be expected is quite out of the question. The Canadian ministers made that clear in their memorandum in reply to the Colonial Office memorandum presented to the conference of 1902 in criticism of the operation of the preferential tariff of Canada. They said:—

'In this connexion it might be noted that the Canadian Government has been attacked by Canadian manufacturers on the ground that the preference is seriously interfering with their trade. The woollen manufacturers have been foremost in the attack, and they have made very bitter complaints to the effect that the industry is threatened with ruin through the severe competition from Britain brought about by the operation of the preference. In brief, these manufacturers claim that the rates on woollens are too low to be protective of their industry.'

That the free list can be extended so as to be of any further service to Great Britain is equally unlikely, for

the reasons laid down by the ministers in the same document. They said:—

‘The policy of the Canadian Government is (and the necessities of the country require it) to admit free of duty, as far as possible, raw materials for the manufacturing industries, and necessities for agricultural, mining, fishing, and other great industries. These raw materials and necessities are largely produced in the United States. Many lines are not produced in Great Britain at all, and many others cannot be obtained by Canadians there to advantage. Great Britain cannot hope to compete in the Canadian market to any appreciable extent in the raw materials we require. It should be observed at this point that the free list of the Canadian tariff is open to all countries. There are no restrictions.’

It is not particularly consoling to be told that there are no restrictions when we are told also that we have no chance to compete. And our confidence in the existence of a controlling body of Canadian opinion in favour of Preference is not increased when we are told that the Canadian Government is attacked by the manufacturers for the preference already accorded.

The advocates of preferential trade in the Colonies are face to face with the intellectual difficulty, which deters even the dervishes of the new faith in Great Britain, viz. how to reconcile Preference with Protection in the Colonies, and how to reconcile Preference with Free Trade at home. In Great Britain there is, on the part of the official preferentialists, a great show of respect for Free Trade—

‘(Free Trade’s) the King he caps to,
Laughing in his sleeve.’

But the official respect is qualified by enough concessions to retain the support of those who have no respect at all. In the Colonies the official respect is for Protection, with enough reservations to retain the support of those who look upon Preference as a step to Free Trade, at least within the Empire. When the colonial preferentialist is asked if he is willing to abandon any part of the present fiscal freedom of the Colonies, or any part of the protection afforded to local industries, his answer—prompt, peremptory, and without exception—is, ‘not

a particle.' If pressed upon the subject, he takes refuge in the familiar platitude that 'some plan can be formed at a conference.' This was the statesmanlike attitude of Mr Micawber, who always hoped that 'something would turn up.' There have been four conferences, and nothing has yet been evolved. But the hopes of Mr Micawber remain unshaken.

One point remains for consideration. What prospect would there be of continuity in a policy which must at once alter the whole commercial policy and practice of the United Kingdom and change the business methods of millions of business men? Once embarked on a policy of inter-Imperial Protection, the ingenuity of the whole outer world would be stimulated to defeat us. We have seen, not so long ago, the United States endeavouring to secure at least the trade of the West Indies by preferential offers; and the West Indies were ready to yield to the temptation. The British Government, however, felt bound to reject the proposals of the United States (C. 4340, 1884-5) on various grounds, public and private, but ostensibly on the ground that 'the proposed arrangement is deficient in the element of stability which Her Majesty's Government consider to be essential to the value of any commercial treaty.' We have seen the same country, in 1893 and in February 1905, making official efforts to detach Newfoundland from Canada commercially by preferential offers. The British Government, after an angry protest from Canada, interfered to check the negotiations in 1893 (Bond-Blaine treaty); and the Senate of the United States, contrary to the policy of the administration, but in assertion of its own peculiar position as the treaty-making power under the constitution, has saved the Imperial Government the trouble of a second interference by rejecting the Bond-Hay treaty in February last. Other nations would be equally solicitous to seduce or to coerce the separate members of the new Zollverein, which has, for its own part, neither the promise nor the potency of universal domination.

What defence would Great Britain enjoy? She would have a 'treaty' with the Colonies, subject to revocation at any time. She would have a series of tariffs openly declared to be subject to revision at every meeting of a colonial legislature whenever the changing conditions of

manufactures, or colonial political exigencies, seemed to call for a change. For example, since the Canadian tariff of 1897 was enacted there have been nine separate Acts altering in some particular the original tariff. As an additional example, take the Preference clause itself. It was originally contained in the tariff of 1897. It had to be altered and enlarged in 1898; it was again altered and enlarged in 1900; it was changed again in order to impose the surtax against Germany in 1903; it was changed again in 1904 in order to make it apply to importations to Canadian ports, and in order to provide a 'dumping clause'; and in the first month of 1905 the dumping clause had to be altered by order in council.

This last alteration suggests another source of trouble. In all the Colonies the tariff is subject to various forms of alteration—(1) by the Governor in council; (2) by order of the Minister of Customs or Commerce; (3) by the Board of Customs. All these alterations have to be closely watched by exporters to Canada and other colonies who do not wish to involve themselves and their consignees in serious practical difficulties. The Parliament of the United Kingdom would have to follow suit; but it could never be certain from year to year what the tariff would be. Every budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be looked for with anxiety. Contracts for any period longer than a season would be hazardous. The whole capital of the country embarked in manufactures would be liable to sudden risks by changing legislation, at home, in the Colonies, and abroad. The whole situation would become intolerable.

To sum up, we have in Canada a country committed since 1858 to a policy of increasing Protection. In 1843 she tried the experiment of a preferential tariff with Great Britain: the result was disaster in 1846. In 1854 she tried a treaty of reciprocity which was preferential as regards the United States: the result was disaster in 1866, qualified by the formation of the Federal Union of 1867. As regards the present scheme we have before us the declarations of ministers—(1) that they are in a general way favourable to it as an idea; (2) that they do not hope for its speedy acceptance in Great Britain; (3) that they will take no further steps till after the general election in Great Britain; (4) that the scheme, when propounded,

must not limit their fiscal freedom or lessen the protection accorded to local industries; (5) that the policy of Canada is purely Canadian in purpose as in origin.

On the other hand, Great Britain has been committed since 1846 to a policy of Free Trade, under which she has established, by individual enterprise as well as by public treaty, trade relations of a profitable character with all the world. She is now asked to abandon this policy and to embark on a policy entirely new, of very doubtful commercial advantage, and, as the experience of protective countries shows, probably detrimental to public morality.

II. AUSTRALIA.

In order to show clearly the existing state of Australian opinion on Preferentialism, it is advisable, first, to give a survey of its history in the Parliament of the Commonwealth. Mr (now Sir) Edmund Barton attended the Imperial Conference of 1902 as Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, and, like other delegates, undertook to submit to his governments, at the earliest opportunity, 'the principle of preferential trade between the United Kingdom and his Majesty's dominions beyond the seas.'

Nevertheless, the question of preferential fiscal treatment was only introduced into Australian politics at the general elections in December 1903, and then in a form very different from that contemplated by the Conference. Mr Deakin had then succeeded Sir Edmund Barton as Prime Minister and leader of the Protectionist party, and he fought the election on the policy of 'fiscal peace and preferential trade for a White Australia.' But he was not prepared to take the initiative in the establishment of preferential trade. On the contrary, the condition on which he and his party insisted was that the initiative should come from the mother-country. The following quotation from his address, delivered on October 29, 1903, in which he formulated the policy of his government, clearly shows this attitude, as well as the kind of preference which he then contemplated, and still contemplates, as his subsequent utterances show :—

'Before giving preference to the mother-country, the South African Federation raised their duties 25 per cent. If Aus-

tralia took the same step, it would not be condemned. When Mr Chamberlain makes his proposals, the Australian Government will be prepared to take them item by item, considering all the circumstances and the importance of the industries to the Commonwealth. The difficulty is that, when we are willing to make such reductions or increases as may be required, we have, instead of the tariff we desired, a tariff so low that it scarcely admits of reductions.'

The Free-traders, under the leadership of Mr G. H. Reid, the present Prime Minister, with few exceptions, opposed preferential treatment, and advocated the reduction of duties to a revenue basis, as a policy productive of greater benefits to the people of the Empire. Mr Reid and several of his followers, however, declared themselves as willing to make this concession. In the event of the electors giving a majority in favour of Protection, they would give substantial preference to British goods by lowering the duties in their favour. But this concession they would make independently, without asking for any return from Great Britain; and they would enter into no bargain which might tie the hands of either the British or the Australian Government.

The elections, resulting in the return of 24 Protectionists, 27 Free-traders, and 24 Labour men, failed to give a majority to either side. The Labour party thus held the balance of power, but they forfeited it by defeating the Deakin Ministry. A Labour Ministry was formed under the leadership of Mr J. C. Watson. It assumed exactly the same attitude towards Mr Chamberlain's policy as that held by the preceding government. Nothing was said or done in Parliament; but, when Mr Watson addressed his electors in August 1903, he referred to Preference in these terms:—

'We should therefore wait until the mother-country has made up her mind on the subject. The first move must come from the mother-country, because she has the largest interest at stake. I have no intention to allow any words of mine to be used as a lever one way or the other.'

Soon afterwards the Free-traders and the majority of the Protectionist party formed a coalition, which resulted in the defeat of the Labour Ministry, and the advent to power of the Coalition Government under the

leadership of Mr Reid. The main condition which made this coalition possible was that the fiscal peace insisted upon by the electors should not be disturbed; and that all parties, the members of the Ministry included, should have a free hand with regard to Preference. Owing to the secession of several Protectionists, the majority of the Reid Government was exceedingly small, amounting to two votes only. The allied Opposition, therefore, might reasonably hope to defeat it if subjects could be brought forward on which the supporters of the Government might be divided. Mr Watson, the leader of the Opposition, consisting of the Labour party and the seceding Protectionists, then pleaded the urgency of increasing duties on several articles of importation, and, more important still, of offering preferential treatment of her imports to the mother-country, without waiting for her to take the initiative. Sir William Lyne, one of Mr Watson's protectionist allies, consequently gave notice of a motion in favour of Preference. Mr Deakin, who had so far been the leading advocate of Preference, succeeded, however, in substituting a resolution of his own for that of Sir William Lyne, and in bringing it to debate towards the end of the recent session. His avowed aim was to unite all sections of the House in support of his proposal by making it vague and indefinite. On this aspect of his resolution Mr Deakin said:—

'Every clause of it has been shaped so that those who profess free-trade principles, as well as those who are Protectionists, may unite in declaring their willingness to take any further advance which may be possible consistent with their principles towards the consolidation of the trade of the Empire. . . . None of us can disguise the fact that as we proceed our paths will separate. . . . We shall afterwards be found so widely separated that we shall probably come to open conflict. Those who may go hand in hand up to the point of declaring in favour of preferential trade relations with the mother-country, will commence to differ so soon as the measure and character of these preferences have to be decided.'

Mr Deakin's resolution ran as follows:—

'Inasmuch as every increase in trade between the mother-country and the Colonies, or any of them, would be of mutual advantage commercially; while eventually, by multiplying

their production, profitable employment, population, and exchanges, such increases must enhance the unity and power of the Empire; this House resolves that:—

- (1) 'The encouragement of industry and commerce within the Empire is a high national aim of paramount importance to all its peoples.
- (2) 'The proposals of the Secretary of State for the Colonies at the Colonial Conference of 1902, as then approved and since tentatively defined, in order to foster inter-Imperial trade, outline a patriotic and statesmanlike policy of internal development and external influence, whose details should be discussed by a further conference at the earliest opportunity.
- (3) 'The Prime Minister be requested to consider the existing openings for preferential trade relations between Australia and other colonies.
- (4) 'The Prime Minister be invited to obtain all data necessary for the preparation of a measure granting a preference to British imports into Australia, which compete solely with imports from foreign countries.
- (5) 'The Prime Minister is hereby authorised for and on behalf of the Commonwealth to offer to the Government of the United Kingdom a preference upon its exports to Australia, in return for a preference on our exports to Great Britain and Ireland, such preference to be reciprocally adjusted according to schedules sanctioned by Parliament.'

The ensuing debate was instructive as to the attitude of the Commonwealth Parliament. Except when Mr Deakin and Mr Reid addressed the House, the attendance of members rarely reached a quorum; and during most of the time, including that occupied by the address of Mr Watson as leader of the Opposition, it varied from five to ten. The galleries, generally crowded when an important debate takes place, were as deserted as the benches of the members. During the three days' debate, only one Free-trader and one Labour member spoke in favour of Preference; Free-traders and Labour men generally showed themselves hostile by interjections or speeches; the non-Labour Protectionists alone gave it anything like unanimous support. No vote was taken on the resolutions themselves, though the Protectionists were very anxious that this should be done. But on the third day of the debate, the motion for its adjournment

gave an opportunity to measure the respective forces, for it was understood that, if adjourned, the debate would not be resumed. The vote on the adjournment became, in these circumstances, virtually a vote on the resolutions in favour of Preference, and was so regarded inside and outside Parliament. Though the adjournment was moved by the Prime Minister, all his protectionist supporters, inclusive of ministers, voted against it, as well as all other Preferentialists. On the other hand, all the opponents of Preferentialism voted for the adjournment together with one or two members who may as yet be in doubt. Especially significant is the fact that only three Labour members supported their leader in voting against adjournment, while seven voted for it, several of them being ardent Protectionists. The motion was carried in a thin house by a majority of five, the voting being 22 for and 17 against the adjournment. That this vote amounts to a defeat of the principle of fiscal Preference is generally recognised, and even admitted by the Melbourne 'Age,' a journal which, more than any other, has, by continued advocacy, given it such prominence as it possesses in Australia. On December 14, 1904, two days after the vote was taken, the 'Age' remarked:—

'There is nothing whatever to be gained by minimising the meaning of the protectionist overthrow. The cause—as a cause—has sustained a set-back which is quite undeniable.'

This vote indicates that a majority of the Federal Parliament is opposed to any offer of Preference. Yet it is generally admitted that a majority of the electors was in favour of Preference at the general elections, and that a majority of the elected candidates had given it some measure of support. But the motives by which these supporters were animated were too various, and even conflicting, to promise any stability of conviction. Mr Reid described the condition fairly correctly when, in the course of the debate, he said:—

'I honestly admit that a majority of the electors of Australia at the last elections pronounced themselves to be in favour, in the abstract, of a policy of preferential trade. . . . But I believe that the greatest mass were anxious simply to do anything which the mother-country thought would help her. I believe that a large number more were fascinated by the

attractive prospect of; an enormous market for Australian produce with a fence raised against other competitors. A large number of Protectionists were also fascinated with the prospect, because they did not think arrangements would be so adjusted as seriously to injure the protected industries of Australia.

This statement, however, might be amended in two respects. One is, as will presently be shown, that a considerable section of the Protectionists expected, and still expect, such an adjustment of duties under Preference as would increase their protective efficiency. The second is that, while the majority of electors pronounced in favour of the principle of Preference, large numbers did so on condition that the preferential policy should first be adopted in the mother-country, they being actuated, not by any love for Preference, but by the desire loyally to acquiesce in any Imperial policy adopted by the people of Great Britain.

Since the elections, however, considerable changes have taken place in public sentiment; and these have affected the attitude of many members of the House. The course of the discussion in the mother-country has shown that a large section—perhaps a majority of the English people—do not think that Preference will be of advantage to Great Britain; and this fact has affected the attitude of those who voted for Preferentialism under the impression that the British people desired it. Furthermore, the Protectionists amongst the rank and file of the Labour party, who generally were in favour of Preference, have, as will presently be shown, altered their opinion in sympathy with the hostile attitude of the working classes of Great Britain. This change of opinion has affected the Labour members of the House of Representatives, the great majority of whom are now opposed to Mr Chamberlain's proposals. Thus the original majority in favour of the principle has become a minority.

The parliamentary party in favour of Preferentialism now consists almost solely of non-Labour Protectionists with a few Free-traders; and these supporters are united on the general principle only, while they differ widely on the method of application. For, while these Free-traders would give preference by lowering existing duties in favour of empire goods, the Protectionists are,

one and all, opposed to such a course, and, with the exception of one or two articles in which the motherland already commands almost the whole trade, will only increase the duties against foreign goods. The utterances of the leading supporters of Preferentialism made during the debate on conciliation are most instructive in this respect. Mr Deakin, who endeavoured to avoid the subject, was forced to deal with it by an interjection. Mr Bruce Smith asked :—

‘Does the honourable and learned member remember telling the Prime Minister, when he sat on this side of the chamber, that he would not be a party to the reduction of the duties?’

Mr Deakin replied :—

‘I beg the honourable member’s pardon: I did not say that. I said that any proposal that preference should be given by a general reduction of duties must come from the other side. That is still true. Any general reduction is not likely to be proposed or supported by me; but I said then, and still say, that reductions are possible. We have to consider the interests of Australia.’

Mr McLean, Minister of Customs (Protectionist), said :—

‘We wish to divert as much of the existing trade of foreign countries as we can to Great Britain, without injury to Australia. I believe that result can very readily be accomplished by judicious readjustment of the tariff when we come to deal with details. In the bulk of cases I believe that we can increase the duties operative against the foreigner whilst allowing them to remain as they are against Great Britain. In some instances, however, I have not the slightest doubt that we can decrease the existing duties in favour of the mother-country. In addition . . . we have a large free list upon which we can operate.’

Sir William Lyne (ex-Minister of Home Affairs and Protectionist, opposed to the Reid Government) said :—

‘I now propose to discuss the question of what we can do in connexion with any such scheme. I claim that we can increase the existing duties against the foreigner. Under present conditions we cannot in any way seriously reduce those duties in favour of Great Britain and at the same time protect native industries.’

Mr J. C. Watson, late Prime Minister (Protectionist), in answer to a question whether he would allow India to share in the preference, said :—

‘No. Except in regard to such products as tea, I would not give any preference to products made by Asiatic labour, which would come into competition with the products made by white people, though I am prepared to give such a preference to the products of the white labour of Great Britain. I think that Australia might very well increase her duties against the foreigner. . . . Speaking generally, I say that our duties for the maintenance of industries are, as protective duties, very low.’

The passage referring to India in Mr Watson's statement deserves particular attention because it faithfully mirrors the attitude of the Labour party, of those who oppose preference as well as of the few who favour it. No preferential arrangement would or could receive a single Labour vote which did not exclude from preferential treatment the British colonies and possessions that rely upon coloured labour for the conduct of their industries, South Africa included. It may also be instructive to indicate the class of articles the duties on which the protectionist Preferentialists are prepared to lower in favour of the mother-country. Two such articles only have so far been mentioned either inside or outside of Parliament—cutlery and cotton goods. No cotton goods and little cutlery are made in Australia; and nearly all such goods are imported from the United Kingdom. Out of the total imports of cutlery, amounting to 98,000*l.*, not less than 83,000*l.* came from Great Britain; and from the same source are derived 1,900,000*l.* worth of cotton and linen goods, the total import of which comes to 2,000,000*l.* Preference on such articles therefore would be merely nominal and of no value to the mother-land.

The attitude of the members of the Commonwealth Parliament is necessarily a reflex of that of the electors. Their attitude is most correctly described by the word ‘apathy.’ A minority, composed of ardent Free-traders and of the bulk of the Labour men, is actively hostile; some ardent Protectionists, mainly manufacturers, are actively friendly; but the great mass of the people of

the Commonwealth are utterly apathetic. The proof of this statement will be found in the following facts. No public meetings have been held for or against Preferentialism, except in Melbourne. Though the Chamber of Manufacturers has assured Mr Chamberlain in letters and telegrams that his proposals receive the ardent support of the Australian people, it has not ventured upon any attempt to obtain such an assurance from the people themselves. This is unprecedented in Australia, where every question of public interest is habitually discussed in public meetings.

This apathy is shown, not only in the towns, but even by the farming population, which alone can expect any pecuniary advantages from preferential treatment of food-stuffs in England. If any section of the Australian people might be expected to show an active interest in Preferentialism, it would surely be those who are to be benefited by it. Yet not a single meeting of farmers has been held in favour of it; nor has one of the numerous bodies representing the farming community, i.e. shire councils, agricultural societies, farmers' leagues, etc., pronounced in favour of it. As already stated, the only exception to this remarkable abstention took place in Melbourne; and the result has been still further to demonstrate the apathy of the general public towards Preferentialism. Towards the end of October last the three associations which uphold Protection in Victoria, and which then were also agitating for an increase of protective duties, i.e. the Protective Association, the Chamber of Manufacturers, and the Trades-hall Council, united in order to institute a campaign in support of Preferentialism. The published programme provided for a great meeting in the Melbourne City Town-hall, and subsequent meetings in every town-hall throughout the metropolitan area. The campaign, however, collapsed after two meetings, one in the Melbourne Town-hall and one in that of Prahran (a suburb of Melbourne), both of these meetings being utter failures as regards attendance, and revealing a remarkable balance of opinion.

The facts as to the Melbourne meeting are especially interesting. Not only had it been advertised largely in every newspaper, but the 'Age' devoted several articles and many paragraphs to the same purpose, while even

the 'Argus' assisted by publishing a hostile leader on the morning of the meeting. The speakers, moreover, were ably selected, comprising, with the exception of Mr Reid, all the public men whom the Melbourne people most desired to hear—Messrs Deakin, Isaacs, Watson, Trenwith, and others. Nevertheless, the audience which was attracted by them was surprisingly small, being less than 700 in a hall which has room for 2400, and which has always been filled to overflowing whenever prominent speakers have addressed themselves to any subject in which the people are interested. Furthermore, of those present, not more than one half could be induced to vote on the resolutions; and these were so evenly divided for and against that the Lord Mayor, who presided, hesitated for some little time before declaring the principal resolution to have been carried.

The second meeting, with which the intended series prematurely closed, gave a similar result, as is shown in the following letter published in the 'Argus,' and signed by Mr Rupert Nicholson, the mover of a hostile amendment. No reply has been made to this letter.

'Sir—I must protest against the action of the organisers of the Prahran meeting in cabling to London that their meeting was indicative of Australian feeling in regard to Mr Chamberlain's policy. There were not more than three hundred people present, of whom only about fifty voted for the resolution and about the same number for the amendment. To represent this result as worthy of consideration by the British public is to grossly mislead them, and ought not to be supported by the chief magistrate of the city in his official capacity.'

Moreover, at this same meeting, Mr Charles Atkins, president of the Chamber of Manufacturers and chief organiser, in moving the principal resolution, complained that he 'had some difficulty in getting speakers for the meeting, because the subject was more or less new, and public men were waiting "on the fence" to see how the cat would jump.' Nothing could more clearly exhibit the apathy of the public than this reluctance of politicians to commit themselves in favour of Preferentialism.

It remains to show that the Preference offered by the only active supporters of Preferentialism—the Protec-

tionists outside Parliament—is of the same futile character as that offered by their compeers in Parliament. The principal resolution carried at the two meetings referred to reads as follows:—

‘That this meeting cordially approves of preferential trade between the mother-country and Australia, having at all times due regard to the industries of the Commonwealth.’

Mr S. Barker, secretary of the Trades-hall Council, and representing it at the Melbourne Town-hall meeting, explained the meaning of the qualifying clause in this resolution as follows:—

‘He would support Britishers against any other nationality, but wanted the local market protected for our own workers. If on enquiry it was found that those seeking preference would grind down the people, they would have nothing to do with it. . . . When there were articles which we could not manufacture, should we not give the British manufacturer preference over the outsider?’

Of the remaining bodies under whose auspices these meetings were organised, the Protectionists’ Association had previously passed the following resolution:—

‘It is further resolved that every tariff alteration made for this purpose’ (Preference) ‘should be based on the principle that the Commonwealth protective duties continue to cover the difference between the cost of labour in Australia and that of other parts of the Empire, so that the fiscal preference given shall be by additional duties upon imports from foreign countries and by discrimination in the free-list or merely revenue-producing items.’

As showing the attitude of the third body, the Chamber of Manufacturers, it may be stated that one of its members, Mr I. Jacobs, has repeatedly urged the necessity of defining the Preference which the Chamber would be prepared to accept. Being unsuccessful, he moved, at the meeting of the Chamber on December 19, 1904, the following resolution, which was made a notice of motion for February 6, 1905, when his object was again defeated, an amendment being carried deleting all the words after ‘local industry’:—

‘That this Chamber earnestly desires to encourage and foster trade with the United Kingdom in preference to trade

with foreign nations, subject to the paramount necessity of promoting and conserving local industry. To obtain both these results it recommends a preferential fiscal treatment of British goods, provided that the duties imposed on such goods equal the difference in labour-cost of such goods as between the United Kingdom and Australia, plus the freight payable to Australian ports.'

The Melbourne 'Age' also has constantly urged that preference to British goods must not be allowed to interfere with the exclusive policy of Protection. Thus, on October 5, 1904, it said :—

'Preferential trade with Great Britain can be brought about in two ways. One is by reducing our present tariff duties on English goods and retaining them against the foreigner; the other is by increasing our duties against the foreigner while retaining them, as at present, against British exports. Seeing that our present tariff is so low in its duties, we cannot consent, either from the revenue or the protective standpoint, that these duties be decreased. We therefore reach the conclusion that a preferential trade policy in Australia means a considerable increase of duty as against the foreigner.'

This attitude of the Australian Preferentialists has, of course, been repeatedly dwelt upon by the opponents of the policy. To quote only the most important of these critics in the press, the Melbourne 'Argus,' on October 9, 1904, wrote as follows :—

'Seeing, then, that we can gain no advantage for ourselves, are the proposers of the preferential revival so generous that they are prepared to give away something to the mother-country? The fact that they comprise our most severe restrictionists answers this question. They are the people who complain that Great Britain is dumping her manufactures on our shores. They are the advocates for starting an iron industry at enormous cost to the electors in order to shut out British iron. They are crying for the raising of duties on imports from Great Britain. Mr Chamberlain has been led to believe that Australians are eager to admit British trade; and all the "preference" the restrictionists are prepared to give them is to put up the duties on goods which Great Britain does not export to Australia.'

The Sydney 'Daily Telegraph' wrote, on September 15, 1904 :—

'One result of the preferential trade debate in the House of Representatives has been a frank avowal of the selfish provincial grounds on which the Preferential party here advocates what Mr Balfour and Mr Chamberlain profess to believe necessary for the high patriotic purpose of solidifying the Empire and maintaining its unity. No substantial remissions of duty are to be made in favour of Great Britain; and the compensation proffered to the Britisher for having the price of his food increased is the knowledge that the foreigner is being treated even worse than himself.'

The Sydney 'Morning Herald,' on December 16, 1904, wrote in the same strain.

The representative mercantile associations of Australia are the Chambers of Commerce of the several states, which are combined under a general council. At the two last annual sittings of the 'General Council of the Chambers of Commerce of Australia,' the question of fiscal preference was debated with the following results. At the annual meeting held in June 1903, Mr S. J. Jacobs (Adelaide), president, moved:—

'That in the opinion of the Council the adoption by the Commonwealth of Australia of preferential trade arrangements with Great Britain is calculated to place the export trade of Australia at a serious disadvantage, and is inimical to the best interests of the commerce of Australia.'

The following amendment was moved by Mr R. J. Alcock (Melbourne), and carried by ten votes to seven:—

'That this Council declares that the adoption by the Commonwealth of preferential trade relations with Great Britain is one that requires earnest and thoughtful consideration, but the Council is unable to express a different opinion thereon until more fully acquainted with the details of the proposal.'

At the annual meeting for the year 1904 an even more pronounced course of apathetic inaction was adopted; Mr W. H. Phillips (Adelaide) moved:—

'That, having due regard to the geographical position of Australia, the circumstances which govern its production, and the consequences of limiting our markets, it has not yet been shown that it is advisable for us to enter into preferential trade arrangements with the United Kingdom.'

On this resolution an amendment was moved by Mr R. J. Larking (Melbourne) to the effect

'That this Council reserves its opinion on the question until the result of the special board of enquiry in England be known.'

After an interesting debate both the original motion and the amendment were withdrawn, the meeting separating without any pronouncement on the subject.

The attitude of the Australian press towards Preferentialism is generally hostile. Of the important dailies, the 'Age' (Melbourne), the 'Advertiser' (Adelaide), and the 'Courier' (Brisbane), advocate it; while the 'Argus' (Melbourne), the 'Daily Telegraph' (Sydney), the 'Register' (Adelaide), the 'Morning Herald' (Sydney), and the 'West Australian' (Perth), as well as 'The Miner' (Kalgoorlie), are hostile. Hostile also is the whole of the Labour press throughout Australia, inclusive of the 'Bulletin' (Sydney), politically the most influential weekly publication in the Commonwealth.

A few words more are needed to make clear the attitude of the Labour party, which elects one third of the members of the House of Representatives and nearly one half of the members of the Senate. This party includes both Free-traders and Protectionists—the fiscal question being treated as not a party subject. Mr J. C. Watson, the leader of the party, is a moderate Protectionist, and, like the rest of that section of the party, gave a mild support to Preferentialism at the general elections. The Victorian members of the party are all Protectionists, as is the great majority of their electors. The latter are politically represented by the Trades-hall Council and the Political Labour League. These two bodies, till quite lately, supported Preferentialism, subject to its not interfering with the protective policy. Through various causes, the principal of which is to be found in the attitude of the English Labour Unions, this support has now been changed into opposition. Thus the Political Labour League passed the following resolution, and sent it for publication to the press on December 5, 1904 :—

'That this meeting of the Melbourne branch of the Political Labour Council of Victoria resolves that the Chamber-

lain scheme of preferential trade will be of no benefit to the working classes of Australia; that it tends to further increase national and racial animosities; that it is against the economic development of Australian industry; and further, that we call upon our fellow-workers in Australia and the United Kingdom to be not misled by the sophistry of capitalistic cliques, whose sole aim and object is the continued exploitation of the working classes of both hemispheres.'

More significant still is the change which has come over the attitude of the Melbourne Trades-hall Council. In October 1904 this body resolved, by a considerable majority, to join in the propaganda for Preferentialism. On December 3, 1904, it was moved to rescind this resolution, and the motion was carried by 23 votes to 17; but, as a majority of two thirds was required, the motion was declared lost. Repeated efforts have since been made by the majority to obtain a declaration expressing hostility to Preferentialism, but have so far been defeated by an ingenious use of the standing orders. Still, the fact remains that the majority of the Trades-hall Council, previously favourable, is now as hostile to Preferentialism as are the working classes generally.

The following, then, is a summary of the situation as it exists in Australia to-day:—

- (1) The vast majority of the people are utterly apathetic as regards Preferentialism.
- (2) The active friends of Preferentialism are mainly protected manufacturers, who expect that an increase in existing duties against foreign goods may give more complete protection to their own products, but will not consent to such a reduction of duties on British goods as would make it easier for these to compete with native industries.
- (3) Till such time as Preferentialism has been adopted in the United Kingdom as an Imperial policy, the Commonwealth will take no steps towards preferential treatment of British goods.
- (4) If Preferentialism is adopted in the mother-land, the majority of the Australian people will, in all probability, be in favour of concluding some arrangement for reciprocal preferential trade relations within the Empire.
- (5) Even then, it is doubtful whether a majority

could be found for any practical proposal, the obstacle being the division, apparently irreconcilable, between the protectionist and free-trade supporters which the adoption of the principle would call forth. A union of the opponents of Preferentialism with either of these supporting wings would probably be strong enough to wreck any measure embodying reciprocal preferential proposals.

Finally, attention may be drawn to the Australian treatment of an aspect of Preferentialism which looms somewhat largely before British eyes. It has been stated that a larger colonial contribution to the defence of the Empire is dependent upon the establishment of the preferential policy. This theory, however, has not found any exponents in Australia. It is universally ignored. Moreover, the free-trade party, hostile to Preferentialism, has repeatedly been pledged by its leader, Mr Reid, to an increase of the Australian contribution. And not only does the majority of the Protectionist party, favourable to Preferentialism, oppose any additional contribution for defence, with or without Preference, but a large section of it favours a discontinuance of the present contribution and the application of the money so set free to the creation of an Australian navy. Similar views are expressed by most of the Labour members. The adoption of Preference by Great Britain is therefore not likely to result in any increase of Australia's contribution to Imperial defence.

Art. XI.—THE CONDITION OF RUSSIA.

ANARCHY employed by the nation as a stepping-stone to order; crime perpetrated by its leaders as a means of establishing law; rebellion fomented by the government as a homeopathic specific against revolution; and ruthless massacres prescribed by Grand-dukes as a cure for disaffection—such are the salient features of the Muscovite panorama which is quickly unrolling itself before the fascinated gaze of the civilised world. Opinions are still divided as to whether we are in presence of a revolution, or merely a temporary splutter of indignation against the régime which is responsible for the war and its consequences. The truth would seem to be that, on the one hand, we are so close to the men and events that we cannot easily view them in correct perspective; and that, on the other, most of our notions, not only about Russian affairs in general, but also about the boons for which the Tsar's subjects are now struggling, stand in need of thorough revision and correction.

To the bulk of Western observers Russia has hitherto seemed to be something apart, a country and a people to which Western notions cannot be applied. Russia, they say, is a civilised and a Christian state, working out its own salvation under its own conditions, governed without a parliament, and subjected to certain curious and perhaps irksome restrictions, but still immensely powerful, immensely rich, and therefore deserving of respect. Its people are satisfied; and what right have strangers to be more exacting? Restless Russian students are the fanatical devotees of a peculiar revolutionary philosophy; the lawless band of Nihilists are the mystics of anarchy. If, in their Oriental frenzy, they occasionally kill a minister or even an emperor, that is only natural; and it is equally natural that for such conduct they should be sent to Siberia, which recent accounts prove to be a region not nearly so inhospitable as people once thought it. But the bulk of the Russian people is quite content without a parliamentary system of government. Religion is part of their politics, and politics an aspect of their religion, while a mystical devotion to the Tsar seems to proceed from both. True, one could not but regret such a mas-

sacre ~~to~~ the Jews as that which took place in Kishineff; but, on the other hand, the Jews are an alien element, and the presence of such keen drivers of hard bargains is no doubt very trying to the Russian population. It is a great pity, too, that the autocracy saw fit to deprive Finland of its liberties; but, after all, it is a law of nature that the strong must swallow up the weak, and one ought not to be too sentimental, in view of the inevitable expansion of a great nation, and the necessity for symmetry and homogeneity in a non-federalised state.

So long as such prepossessions as these hold the Western mind, it is not wonderful that Russian affairs are weighed in balances different from our own. As some of the letters of the Russian alphabet, while identical in form with ours, are in reality very different, so political and social terms, when used in Russia, connote quite other ideas. Among a people who regarded happiness as compatible with absolutism, and religious beliefs as dependent upon imperial ukases, revolution appeared to be wholly inconceivable. The employment of violence seemed foreign to the ideas of the nation. The greatest Russian writers, with all their ethical ardour, proclaim a lofty quietism, a persistent and ungrudging self-renunciation, wherein no echo could be heard of that battle-cry of liberty that broke the chains of despotism in western Europe. A quiet acceptance of suffering and hardship, the freedom of a spirit that claims nothing for itself but lives constantly under the spell of the sweet sad music of human sorrow, to share in which meant purification and redemption—this seemed to be the *nirvana* towards which the loftiest Russian aspiration tended; a goal of the East, not of the West; a striving of the cloister, not of the market-place; an ideal of renunciation, not of progress. And the fact that the teaching of Tolstoy, and, in a less degree, that of Dostoieffsky, found a footing in western Europe, seemed to indicate that Russia's ethical contribution to the process of Western civilisation was to be of the negative rather than of the positive order; and that, on the vexed question of the relation of institutions to national development, she would probably make no definite pronouncement.

These traditional conceptions of Russia's temper and accepted forecasts of her destiny have been rudely shaken

by the tempestuous events of the past five months. It has now become clear that the Russian people is made of the same clay as European nations. For from out of the turmoil of conflicting forces a cry of liberty has been heard; and its note is as pure and fresh, as passionate and inspiring, as when it first rang out in the early morning of modern Europe. Even Slav resignation has its limits; and Muscovite mysticism cannot wholly detach itself from the things of the material world. In Russia, as in France, the monarch whose severity exceeds that of the written law is a tyrant; and in the East, as in the West, dishonoured bills and unpaid debts ultimately lead to bankruptcy.

In reality the conflict between people and government has been going on for many years; but its manifestations were till recently so well hidden or disguised by the authorities that to outsiders the process was like that of some insidious yet ravaging illness whose symptoms are internal and painless. The root of the evil is what it has long been—the substitution of arbitrary caprice for the uniform action of law; but the change of conditions effected during the last generation now renders the fruits more deadly than before. On the other hand, the mental and material advance made by the Russian people of late years enables it, not only to see the source of its suffering, but to make an effort to seal it up. All nationalities, all classes, all sections, professions, and public bodies, frankly laid their grievances before Prince Mirsky. A year ago this audacity would have been punished as a crime.

But people and Government cannot come to an understanding so long as the one asks for reform and the other offers palliatives, so long as the one complains of a upas-tree and the other holds out no more than hopes that certain of its branches may some day be lopped off. On the one hand, the autocracy persists in carrying on the affairs political, social, intellectual, and religious, of 140,000,000 of human beings by means of arbitrary orders issued by several thousand officials, each of whom participates in the absolutism and the impunity of the Tsar. On the other hand, the people ask to be governed by law, which shall be respected by all classes and individuals alike. Thus the popular demand implies a permanent guardian of legality, while the Government offer pro-

claims that any such guardianship would supersede the autocracy. Such is the essence of the dispute between the partisans of the Tsar and the body of the nation.

Nicholas II, in his ukase of last December, confessed that legality had taken no root in his realm, while making the noteworthy avowal that law is the most important mainstay of the throne in an autocratic state. It is not easy for a logical mind to make these admissions and yet to shrink from the conclusions which flow directly from them. If the law-breakers have always been the bureaucrats, it is evident that one cannot honestly appoint them to be the guardians of the law. The wolf may be willing to offer his services as a sheep-dog, but he will never be a good substitute for the collie. Whether, therefore, the Tsar confides the task to the Senate, the Council of the Empire, or the police, is immaterial. No branch of the law-breaking bureaucracy can play the rôle of guardian of legality against the caprice of the bureaucracy, because to do so would demand a degree of civic virtue and selflessness on the part of the bureaucrats so high as to render all checks and barriers superfluous. Moreover, what the Tsar has given the Tsar may take away. Autocracy and legality are therefore incompatible.

Examples are numerous and instructive. A comparison between the administration of Prince Mirsky and that of his successor will reveal a whole series of them. Speaking summarily, one might say that Mirsky's régime was an attempt to entrust to a half-free press that defence of law which could not be confided to the bureaucracy without insulting the Russian people. But the experiment, in so far as it was an endeavour to avoid facing the problem fairly and to substitute a sham for a reality, was a failure. What it proved, and proved conclusively, was that a free press, were it really free, would serve as a powerful lever, sufficient to lift up and remove all the obstacles in the way of other reforms. The timid spirits among the Liberals, the men who, instead of amputating a shattered limb, would fain treat it with sugar-coated pills, asserted then that almost enough had been accorded, and that the liberty enjoyed by the press never would, never could, be curtailed. They were optimists whose forecasts have since been belied by events. All the Liberal papers but one which then sprang up have since

ceased to appear. The one exception is the 'Son of the Fatherland,' which has again come out after three months' suppression. But this paper, printed and made up, has to be laid before the censor at eleven o'clock every night on the eve of its issue. The journals which remain are not allowed to keep the public informed of the historic events of the day. A Russian whose knowledge of the contemporary history of his people is derived only from the journals of St Petersburg and Moscow, would still be ignorant of the dimensions of all the great strikes, of the details of the massacre of Vladimir's Day, of the insurrection in Guria, of the atrocities of Baku, of the disaster of Mukden—in a word, of nearly all the salient events which are changing the face of Russia.

Nevertheless, it was the Tsar himself who exhorted the press to collaborate with him and his ministers by publishing the truth; and it is by order of the Tsar that his ministers are now concerting measures for freeing the press from the fetters which they are continuing to forge for it. In like manner, they are discussing, with the hair-splitting ingenuity of theological casuistry, the extent to which they can remove some of the more harrowing features of religious persecution without granting liberty of conscience. Thus the wounds may be healed which the madman has inflicted, but the knife will not be snatched from his hand, nor will a keeper watch over his movements. In a very short time, perhaps at this very moment—thanks to the vigorous advocacy of M. Witte, whose weight has been hitherto thrown into the scale on the side of popular liberties—nearly nine hundred persons imprisoned for swerving from orthodoxy will be set free. They will be released after long terms of confinement, some having languished for over a quarter of a century in damp, murky cells. But the arbitrary power that sent them thither is not to be curbed. Not even M. Witte's pleading could work that miracle. The injury done to them several years ago may consequently be inflicted on their fellows to-morrow. That privilege screens the serpent that gnaws the Yggdrasil of Russian autocracy, and has well-nigh eaten it away.

What is there to hinder the autocrat from repealing six months or six days hence, the concessions which he bestowed to-day? 'Nothing,' answers history; 'Nothing,'

echoes the people; 'Nothing,' exclaims the monarch. This is the point at which the hostile forces must sooner or later clash, for there is no reconciliation possible. Nor is it a mere matter of theory to Nicholas II; he is minded to exercise to the full the discretionary power which he claims as his right. On March 3, when he issued his last manifesto and rescript, he also published a ukase to the Senate, bestowing upon his people the right to petition the Government on the subject of their needs. Sixteen days later the men of letters of the Russian capital met together to avail themselves of this right. The superintendent of the police forbade the meeting. The men of letters appealed to the Prefect of Police, who duly informed them he had received a 'restrictive interpretation' of the imperial ukase, according to which that document allows private persons to send petitions 'only one by one,' but not conjointly. The would-be petitioners objected that the interpretation was not only illegal, but absurd; for 'if,' argued the president, 'we wish to petition the minister to allow us to revive the Authors' League, we cannot do it one by one.' Thereupon the Prefect generously modified the restrictive construction he had so mysteriously received, and stated he would allow a meeting, but not to more than thirty persons. And after the Tsar's ukase the right to petition is less than it was before. In a word, autocracy, while willing to prune the leaves, and perhaps even cut off a branch, of the upas-tree, insists on letting it grow and thrive as before. On the other hand, the leaders of the people are resolved to tear it up by the roots. Manifestly these two forces must clash; they can never unite.

The autocracy will not surrender its position, except under compulsion, and force is accordingly being applied. The question has been asked whether the compulsion which is now being brought to bear upon it from all sides amounts to a revolution? Those who regard the movement as short-lived point to the fitfulness of its manifestations, its lack of organisation, the meagreness of its results, the ease with which the Government violates its promises and withdraws its concessions; and they ask triumphantly where the Russian counterpart to the storming of the Bastille or the Tennis-court oath is to be found? One answer is that a revolution, in the

restricted historical sense, has not begun. And yet the Russia of the twentieth century is demonstrating in manifold ways that blood is the price of liberty and dethronement may be the wage of tyranny. The existing system is giving way under the pressure of force.

Force was applied first by the Japanese, with whom the autocracy went to war, confident of victory, which would have meant a new spell of license at home. For before the rupture with Japan there seemed imminent danger of a conflict in Russia between the rulers and the ruled. It had become dangerously acute when the first shots were fired in the Far East. Soon the foreign enemy, by blow after blow, exposed the glaring defects of the autocratic system, not only to the dazed Russian people, but to a world that rubbed its eyes in astonishment at the fading away of its old belief in the reality of Russia's power. The national pride, upon which the autocracy could always count with such confidence, was dragged in the dust; and in the humiliation of defeat the people began to perceive certain political truths to which its old delusions had kept it blind. Thus in one short year the war has matured and given the finishing touches to a mental revolution which a quarter of a century of propaganda would have failed to accomplish, for it has placed the misdoings of the Russian administration in the fierce light of a national tragedy. The most durable work accomplished by the Japanese arms is not the crippling of Russia's finances, the slaughter of her soldiers, or the infliction of a serious blow upon her military prestige; it is the education of the mass of the Russian people to a conception of its urgent political need.

A peasant from a district of the province of Tver goes to the war and receives a bullet in his leg at Liauyang. The wound is badly dressed, and the sufferer is flung into a cold-goods waggon and taken by slow stages to Irkutsk, where he is transferred to a 'sanitary' train. His wound is not washed or dressed; he shivers in the frosty air that finds its way through crack and crevice; and, receiving just food enough to keep him from actual death on the journey, he suffers agonies of hunger. When finally, all skin and bone, and with a festering wound, he reaches his native place, it is only to learn that his father and mother have gone to St Petersburg,

and that in the village not a single relative is left. Sick in soul and body, he applies to the *zemsky nachalnik*, the nobleman who is paid to exemplify, to the two or three thousand peasants under his charge, the Tsar's care of his people. 'My father and mother,' he says, 'have gone to St Petersburg. I am ill and cannot work yet. I have no money, and there is no one here to help me. Be merciful, your honour; give me a few coins to take me to my parents. God will repay you and so will I when I am able.' 'Begone from here,' replies the *nachalnik* gruffly. 'Almsgiving is none of my business.' That peasant has received a lesson in politics; and, if his soul now turns with bitter hatred against all those who, to him, represent authority—against self-indulgent officers, negligent ambulance officials, all who in the long days of his exquisite suffering passed him coldly by and would not lend him a helping hand, the autocracy may congratulate itself upon the success it has achieved in the work of supplying a political education to its backward peasantry. 'France is better off than Russia,' one of them recently remarked, 'for there is no Tsar there!'

Take another example. It is the depth of winter in a district near St Petersburg. Out of doors a bitter wind is blowing over the snow-covered fields and the frozen river. In the kitchen of a manor-house a tall, red-bearded peasant is drinking vodka and talking excitedly to the squire's son. 'Aye, your honour, such is fate. I have to start for the war this very evening; and God only knows whether a day will dawn on my return. I can't say no to the summons. There's no help for it. But why do they summon me?' he continues angrily. 'Look, I have five children and a wife, and there'll be no one to work for them when I've left. Who's to get in the corn this year? how are the taxes to be paid? how are the children to be fed? If I were a single man I shouldn't care. It wouldn't matter then if I were killed. But now—good Lord! At home starvation, and out there—still worse. I saw a fellow that came back a few days ago. He was wounded out there. Once, he told me, when they were four days without food, they ate dog's flesh, and then human flesh. And they take you from your family to send you to such horrors. Good Lord! Good Lord! Why does the Tsar want Manchuria so?'

Shakhnenko is the name of a man of the village of Obukhovitch, in the province of Kieff, who was called the other day to serve. He prayed to be let off, but in vain. He pleaded that he had a wife and three children, of whom the oldest was only five, and that they would have no means of subsistence, literally nothing at all. It was true, only too true, some people whispered; for the peasants who could afford to pay twenty or thirty pounds remained at home. Shakhnenko was told that there was no discharge in this war—at any rate, none for the likes of him. So he went to the war. His wife was forced to go about begging for herself and her babies from hut to hut, where she met numerous competitors; * for none of the families of the men at the front had received the money owed them by the State. Is it surprising that that man and his kindred bear a grudge to the system of which these are the fruits?

It is under such conditions that Russian peasants go to the front. In the war they learn their politics and bring their lesson home with them. And their politics are very simple—irreconcilable hostility to the vague mass of persons and institutions that condemn them and theirs to such wanton suffering. The wrath is spreading in the villages, fed by the long-smouldering flame of resentment against old wrongs, by the utter lack of law and equity, the crushing burden of taxation, the petty tyranny of *starchina*† and *zemsky nachalnik*,† the misery of life without hope of improvement. That sentiment is being enlightened and directed against the Government by the persistent efforts of revolutionary agitators, who, in spite of the watchfulness of the police, carry on a vigorous and successful propaganda in the rural districts of central Russia. It is important to dwell on the effect of the war upon the peasant's attitude towards his Government, because herein lies the chief element of danger to the existing system. But much more than the system is menaced by the peril. The ancient spell of blind and abject loyalty once broken, forces will be let loose, the direction and impetus of which no man can estimate. It is clear, however, that unless they become

* 'Slovo,' March 2, 1905; Gazette of Kieff, March 5.

† Rural officials, who, as a rule, are deservedly unpopular.

absorbed in some powerful constructive process their effect will be indiscriminately destructive.

If the war in the Far East has had the effect of accelerating the first stage of revolution, the Socialist revolutionary party takes care to give point to the growing demand for liberty by applying force in forms hitherto regarded as criminal. In a country where lawless violence and patriotic duty are at opposite ethical poles, and no attempt to join them can seem justifiable, the phenomenon requires explanation. It is to be found in the conditions held to justify every revolution known to history and welcomed by men, conditions which are aggravated by the numbers of the Russian people, the intelligence of the educated classes, and the cynicism with which the autocracy plunges the masses in ignorance, superstition, and misery.

The force which, in revolutionary England and France, spent itself in open insurrection has no such outlet in contemporary Russia; it cannot even embody itself in journalistic articles or eloquent speeches. In a word, all the peaceful means, legal and illegal, of influencing the autocracy are placed beyond the reach of the reform party. Drastic remedies are required; yet nothing can be effected but by violent means. The bomb, the revolver, the dagger have thus usurped the functions of the mass petition, the public speech, the leading article. Yet a short time ago the revolutionary party were not hopeful of success. Plehve's assassin, Sozonoff, in the defence which he wrote in prison while awaiting his trial, stated plainly that he did not venture to hope to bring about any change in the régime. He wanted merely to kill the petty tyrant, but did not expect to damage the political framework of the government. To visit Plehve's many crimes on his head, that, he said, was his motive. He described how, during the whole of his journey from Siberia, he was urged on by voices that exclaimed, 'To Plehve you must go! You must go to Plehve!'

Yet much more was attained than Sozonoff dared to hope: a new era was inaugurated. The concessions bestowed under Mirsky have indeed been rescinded; but the blow that struck down Plehve made an advance which cannot altogether be retraced. It is only natural that the temporary success should embolden the Revolutionists

and win them new recruits. It is not surprising to learn that the Social Democratic party, which was hitherto an implacable enemy of violence, has lately endorsed the views of the Revolutionists, and expressed the conviction that the bomb, the revolver, and the dagger are the only means of which Russians now dispose to modify the misrule of the autoocracy. And lest there should be any ethical misgiving in the minds of these men of action, Russian society has signified in no uncertain terms its approval of methods which, under less severe conditions, it would brand with an indelible mark of obloquy. These facts should be borne in mind by those who sit in judgment on Russian revolutionists.

The Terrorists have some grounds therefore for regarding their policy as successful, in so far as it tends to strike a wholesome and paralysing fear to the hearts of those who have the will and the power to make mischief. But it cannot be denied that the autoocracy is able to retaliate in many ways; and the pestilence that worketh in darkness is a force which the Russian authorities know how most cunningly to employ. Much of recent history is made up of the manifestations of police terrorism, the baleful results of which may yet darken the future of the whole nation; for it has raised a spirit which, once conjured up, may not be laid until it has wrought havoc. One day in February a startling report was circulated throughout Russia that a formal battle was raging in Baku between Tartars and Armenians. When details of the calamity reached St Petersburg it became clear that it was not so much a battle as a butchery. It was a butchery much more gruesome and inhuman than that of Kishineff, but the methods employed were the same.

The massacre at Baku was carried out with the connivance and, there is good reason to believe, at the direct instigation of the police authorities. There is also strong evidence in favour of the statement that an unforeseen incident hastened the horrible proceedings by a couple of days. A Tartar spy had been killed by Armenian terrorists. Certain bands of Tartars, recruited from the suburbs and supplied with army-rifles and revolvers, immediately fell upon the Armenians on the pretext of avenging their co-religionist. The police made no attempt to interfere with their allies; the soldiers in the streets carried on

friendly conversation with the Tartar assailants, and even protected the Tartar shops. No interference was permitted. Armenian and Russian workmen, who set out from the industrial region of Bibi-Ribat to do what the soldiers and police ought to have accomplished, were stopped on the way by Cossacks. The houses of prominent Armenian merchants were leisurely burned, and their inmates deliberately murdered, because the police believed that they concealed a stock of weapons belonging to the Armenian Terrorist Committee. Demonic fury, paralysing terror, and bestial enjoyment were elements of the saturnalia. For five days the slaughter raged; streets ran with blood; corpses lay on the pavement unburied; wounded men and women quivered in death-spasms while soldiers and police smoked cigarettes and cracked jokes. And the Governor made no sign. Finally, Armenian ecclesiastics, knowing that there was no quarrel between their people and the Tartars, and believing that the slaughter had been artificially arranged, appealed to the Mohammedan chief sheikh; and at once there was peace. Then, and only then, orders were issued by the Tsar's representatives. It was 'mustard after dinner,' the Armenians said. They added—and their statement still awaits refutation—that the origin of the butchery was this. A political demonstration of the inhabitants who, without racial or religious distinction, were in favour of a legislative assembly, had been planned to take place on a certain day; and the police, with a refinement of ingenuity, resolved to divert the attention of the people from the crimes of the autocracy by evoking an outburst of racial hatred. They planned the massacre accordingly for the date fixed for the demonstration, but the murder of the Tartar spy hastened its beginning by two days. The police proved successful, but short-sighted. If, for a short space, they turned the attention of the people from the misrule of the Tsar to scenes of internal strife, they diverted for a long time the sympathies of the civilised world from the Russian autocracy.*

The Baku massacre is perhaps the most startling illustration of the methods which the police have applied

* Since this paragraph was put in type, a letter from Mr H. F. B. Lynch, confirming most of the particulars here stated, has appeared in the 'Times' (April 1).

with stealthy diligence in all parts of the Empire at every critical moment. Where there were Jews, as in Riga, proclamations were freely distributed inciting the Orthodox rabble to attack them. In Rostoff-on-the-Don both Hebrews and Armenians were marked out as the victims. Where the population is purely Russian, it is urged to maltreat the class most obnoxious to the authorities. In Moscow the report that the police were organising groups of roughs who were to club students and 'intellectuals' led to a timely appeal by the population to the Prefect of the Police to take measures to ensure order. But police promises tranquillised no one; and the Town Council has seriously begun to consider the advisability of organising a militia force in order to defend the population of Moscow against its paid defenders. Other cities and towns have followed the example of the ancient capital; and, if the Government refuse to authorise the creation of a civic guard, people will probably arm and make common cause against the official protectors of the Tsardom. Truly this implies a powerful indictment against the autocracy; but the *prima facie* evidence is strong. In Kursk and Kaluga, for instance, schoolboys were brutally beaten while the police calmly looked on as though violence were a duty. In Kaluga two of the roughs were arrested, presumably by way of saving appearances; but they were released on the receipt of a letter from the chief of the gendarmerie declaring that they were his head-men. Reasonable fears were entertained that the police intended to use the same cruel and demoralising weapon in St Petersburg, and were collecting gangs of ruffians for the anniversary of the emancipation of the serfs to beat and kill students and prominent members of the Liberal party. But society took precautionary measures and warded off the danger.

When a system can be bolstered up for a time by downright demoralisation, and when its professional supporters can devise nothing less harmful, it is fair to conclude that its lease of existence is running out. To sow dissensions among various sections of the people had long been an expedient of the autocracy. The non-Russian or non-Orthodox elements of the community were saddled with the responsibility for national misfortunes. Jews,

Finns, Armenians, Poles, Stundists, Uniats, Dukhobortsy, were fiercely denounced in turn. But now, in the extremity of its distress, the autocracy has raised this method to the rank of an administrative principle. Its agents, unhampered by prejudice, pit the well-to-do burgher against the working-man, the working-man against the 'intellectual,' the peasant against the member of the Zemstvo, the Tartar against the Armenian, the Orthodox against the heretic, the 'hooligan' against them all. Terror is the watchword; and, as the morbid fancy of the writer Andreyeff discerns in the horrors of the Manchurian war nothing but the grim insanity of a 'red laughter,' so to the overwrought imagination of many Russians has appeared the vision of a more fearful 'black laughter' that, with the fierce derision of the lowest depths, will sweep away that earnest of freedom which a short time ago seemed within their reach.

It is the arbitrary and unrestricted application of force on both sides that gives the present conflict between the Russian Government and its people something of the aspect of a revolution. The conditions are not those of eighteenth century France. A Slav revolution, working over vast stretches of space and intervals of time, and marked by Slav passivity, cannot resemble the upheaval of 1789. Country, people, epoch, in a word, all the elements of the struggle are different. At present the extent of revolutionary operations within purely Russian territory is very slight, being confined almost entirely to fitful acts of terrorism on the part of the Socialist revolutionary party. The only portion of the Empire in which an organised revolt might break out is the Caucasus, which has indeed been in a state of smouldering insurrection for two years past. Russia has never been able to assimilate the motley population of that province; and her efforts to extinguish national differences by open force or masked violence have had the result of accentuating these differences, and implanting in the hearts of Armenians, Georgians, and highlanders an irreconcilable hatred of her rule. Her hand is against all races and all religions there—even her own. The Georgians, for instance, are as orthodox as the Tsar; and for that reason among others the Government might be expected to treat them with favour or justice. But the autocracy pro-

scribes the Georgian tongue even in elementary schools, and stupefies Georgian children by a pantomime which is supposed to initiate them directly into the mysteries of the Russian language without the medium of their own. Even in the Church services the use of the Georgian language is being forbidden. The Georgians delight in war; and since the days of Prince Bagration, of Napoleonic fame, some of the leading officers of the Russian army have been members of that chivalrous race. But nowadays, when the time comes for a Georgian youth to serve his term as a soldier, he is sent off to Siberia, or to the interior of European Russia, where the unwonted rigours of the climate work havoc with his health, and the enforced exile embitters him against Russian rule. And in the background of this picture of harassing restrictions the student of history discerns a long line of violated Russian pledges and broken treaties extending back to the days of Paul I.

The Armenians are no better off; indeed in many respects their lot is much harder, because their religion is not identical with that of the autocracy. They, too, have had to remain passive while the Government strove to make them think Russian thoughts by eradicating their native tongue. In the time of the Minister of Education, Delyanoff, himself an Armenian, the Armenian language was forbidden in schools; but the sphere of religion was left untouched until two years ago, when M. Plehve threw the whole people into a ferment by ordering the transfer of Armenian ecclesiastical property to the Russian treasury. Since then there has been no peace in the Caucasus, nor will there be until that and other unjust measures have been repealed. Armenians, Georgians, Mingrelians, Imeritians, and the manifold tribes of the mountains, have long been suffering all the hardships of Russian arbitrary rule, aggravated by the personal whims of military and civil officials, some of whom, like the ex-Governor-General, Prince Galitzin, were mentally and morally abnormal. Count Vorontsoff-Dashkoff, who has just been appointed Viceroy of the Caucasus with extensive powers, bears the reputation of a moderate, well-meaning man and a good administrator. If he come out of the Caucasian ordeal unscathed, he will have given convincing proof of sterling

qualities exceedingly rare among the latter-day public servants of the autocracy.

Meanwhile revolution, in the most unequivocal sense of the word, has become an accomplished fact in the Caucasus. For a long time past the Armenian National party (the Droshakists) and the Georgian National party (the Sakartevlists) have been endeavouring, under difficulties, to work among their respective compatriots the machinery of government which the Russians had transformed into an agency of demoralisation. The most conspicuous result of their activity is that, in the rural districts of the provinces of Kars and Erivan, the Crown courts have virtually been replaced by secret native tribunals which administer rough justice to the peasantry swiftly and cheaply. The positive evils which emanated from the Russian police have thus been counteracted or lessened by the employment of a form of violence to which, in other countries, the epithet of criminal would be given as a matter of course.

The tragic element in the situation, not in the Caucasus only, but throughout the dominions of the Tsar, lies in the circumstance that the so-called legal influences are the sources of wanton evil; while such good results as are obtained are produced by agencies which we are wont to consider baneful. Thus the Armenian Nationalist Committee, which has long been in practical possession of the province of Erivan, has successfully maintained order and banished vulgar crime there. The Georgian Sakartevlists are leading a not unsuccessful revolt in Batoum and Kars; while the entire population of the Ozurget district,* which is Orthodox, has risen against the Government and practically cut itself off from the Russian Empire. Arms and ammunition are imported into the disturbed districts in large quantities; and from time to time one reads of the seizure of rifle-cartridges or the discovery and confiscation of a couple of mountain-guns by Russian officials. The two great Nationalist parties have further agreed to unite with the Socialists, who had hitherto been opposed to violent methods, and to organise a general insurrection in the spring.

* It is generally known as Guria, and lies between Batoum and Tiflis on either side of the Kura.

The authorities, callous and inexorable when the people are peaceful or disorganised, display a yielding disposition before the armed tribes of the Caucasus. Thus, some time before the rising, the libraries of the Gurians were closed by order of the Governor-General, and the language of the inhabitants was proscribed. But to-day General Alikhanoff has published an order permitting them all to be reopened. Concessions granted under such conditions are tantamount to premiums on organised rebellion, and are thus interpreted by the people of central and southern Russia, who see the promises uttered by Prince Mirsky and the Tsar himself infringed or withdrawn without apology or explanation. That is doubtless why the entire Russian people are making ready to put powerful pressure upon the Tsardom in the spring.

From the armed and successful insurrection of the Caucasus to the protests of St Petersburg workmen who are shot down for proclaiming their trust in the Tsar, a gradual transition is offered by the Polish movement, which partakes of the characteristics of both. The desire to rescue precious national possessions from the withering grasp of the bureaucracy is no less strong amongst the countrymen of Sienkiewicz than amongst the Armenians or Georgians; but the dread of German interference is perhaps more powerful even than antipathy to the Russian Government, and contributes to check for the moment the display of national aspirations in any form more provocative than that of a party programme or a respectful petition. Down to the end of M. Plehve's régime there were only two alternatives in Polish politics, either servile conformity to Russian rule or revolutionary conspiracy; and the latter was eschewed by all. The relaxation of tension that accompanied Prince Mirsky's entrance upon office supplied a welcome opportunity for the formation of groups less extreme in their aims and more practical in their methods. Of these the Progressive Democratic party is the most influential; and its programme indicates the minimum of demands whose satisfaction would content the Polish people at this moment. Briefly these are: (1) the restoration to Poland of the political organisation it enjoyed at the time of its incorporation with Russia; (2) autonomy based on an organic statute elaborated by a Polish assembly elected

by direct and secret vote, such autonomy, however, not to exclude the kingdom of Poland from participation in the affairs of the Russian Empire as a whole; (3) equality of rights for the Poles in Lithuania and Little Russia.

Among the reforms implied by this programme are included the restoration of the native language to its position as the medium of common intercourse in Poland, and its employment in schools, law-courts, and administrative institutions; the abolition of restrictions and privileges derived from nationality or religious belief; the legal recognition of the marriages of Uniats,* and the pardon of all Uniats imprisoned or exiled for fidelity to their creed; freedom of association, freedom of assembly, freedom to strike work, freedom of belief and of public speech; inviolability of persons and dwellings; abolition of the administrative method of dealing with political crimes; amnesty for persons condemned for political reasons; equality of rights as between Poles and other citizens of the Empire; compulsory elementary education under the control of the community; and autonomy of the urban and village communities. This union of national and economic claims with demands of a more general character, to which every Russian citizen might subscribe, characterises accurately the present temper and situation of the fettered people.

The remarkable thing is that no attempt has been made during the present crisis to enforce these demands by anything in the nature of an armed rising. This is all the more strange because the demoralising lesson of the value of violence as a means, indeed the only means, of obtaining redress has been inculcated with special stress in Poland. Towards the end of March last a deputation of Poles repaired to St Petersburg and presented humble and respectful petitions to various ministers, asking that Polish children might use their native language in their schools. A humble petition, at a moment when rifle-cartridges and bombs were in vogue, ought to have impressed the authorities favourably. Besides this, some of the ministers had beforehand privately assured the Poles of their sympathy and support. Yet when they came to

* Members of that branch of the Eastern Church which, while it observes the rites and ceremonies of the Russian Orthodox community, recognises the authority of the Pope, and is in communion with the Vatican.

the point, the deputation was gruffly received, even by its whilom supporters, and was informed that neither now nor in the future could any hope of such concessions be held out. Moreover the Government informed the teaching staff of the private schools in Warsaw that, if they dared to teach children in private houses, they would be disqualified for ever for the career of education. It would not be surprising if the Polish people, thus humiliated, were to yield to temptation and, like their brethren in suffering, to have recourse to force. But of this there is at present little apparent probability.

A different course has been adopted by Polish operatives, whose demands are not identical with those of the national leaders. The workmen have begun to realise that they may exert a powerful influence by simply refusing to work, and that the concession of political rights is the first step towards the attainment of those economical reforms for which they have recently, under the influence of the Socialist parties, learned to strive. It is at this point that the agitation in Poland displays its fundamental unity with the Russian movement as a whole; for in the Russian internal situation at the present moment one of the most salient facts is the sudden recrudescence of the Labour movement.

The Labour movement had its origin in the west and south of European Russia; and, under the direction of the Social Democratic party, its aims were primarily of an economic character. On the whole, the great strike which spread through the south of Russia in the summer of 1903 maintained this character consistently, though the interference of the administrative authorities on behalf of the employers imparted a political colouring to many of the workmen's demonstrations; while in Odessa an immediate impulse to the strike came from an association of operatives that had been specially organised by one of Plehve's agents for provocative purposes. The chief demands of the men were for shorter hours and more wages, while the immediate object of the leaders was, in the main, to educate the workmen to a consciousness of the strength which union and discipline bestow. The political element in the Russian movement was very little stronger than it would be in an ordinary American strike; and the self-restraint of the men was astonishing. Equally astonish-

ing was the circumstance that the only answer which the Government could think of was formulated in terms of rifle-bullets and sabres. For the moment 'order was restored.' This grandiose effort was not followed up by other workmen's demonstrations on a large scale, chiefly, as it would seem, because its easy suppression seemed to prove that Russia was not yet ripe for a Labour movement on the Western pattern.

The situation began to change when, in Baku last December, the operatives of the naphtha wells, by resolutely eschewing work, scored an economic victory which their comrades in Europe and America might well regard with envy. The echoes of the Baku triumph had hardly died away when the Labour movement throughout Russia sprang without any warning into life, this time to direct its attacks, not primarily against the employers, but against the Government. The impulse went out from that very St Petersburg which had for long been the despair of socialist agitators. George Gapon, an indifferent priest, a mediocre citizen, and a fanatical leader, who could fire men's souls, had materially contributed to the work. Under the very eyes of the police, and armed with special tokens of imperial favour, he had educated a strong band of workmen into a clear consciousness, not only of their economic, but also of their political needs. Guided by an extraordinary instinct, which stood him in better stead than all the learning of the schools, he chose the best possible method of tearing from the eyes of the St Petersburg working-man the veil of traditional loyalty that had blinded him to the most essential difficulty of his situation—his lack of liberty of action. For, when the Cossacks, in the Tsar's name, fired upon the Tsar's petitioning subjects, and upon the symbols of their loyalty, their nationality, and their faith, the workmen realised, with the finality of absolute conviction, that it was his Government that stood in the way of his deliverance.

Like an electric shock the news of the St Petersburg massacre (January 22) spread through the Empire; and in hundreds of factories and workshops men laid down their tools and walked out in fierce indignation at the action of the Government. The opportunity was naturally utilised to present certain economic demands to the employers; but in many cases, where these were granted,

the men struck again after a few days' work. On a number of lines the railway-men stood idle; and traffic in many parts of the Empire would have come to a complete standstill if the Minister of Ways and Communications had not, by liberal promises on the one hand and menaces on the other, induced the men to return to work. In Riga the workmen, who were armed, fought against the troops; in Poland the strike was accompanied by political demonstrations, which the police attempted to counteract by encouraging looting on the part of the roughs. In St Petersburg the men began, after a few days, to return to their occupations, sullenly and under the compulsion of hunger, but only to strike again when the pinch of starvation had ceased to be felt. The Minister of Finance having consulted with the employers, the latter declared that the causes of the strike were primarily political, while the Minister as stoutly averred that they were economical. Some thirty workmen, routed out of bed before dawn, roughly washed and newly clad, were escorted by detectives through rows of armed soldiers to the palace at Tsarskoe Selo, where the Emperor received them and read an allocution. To the kidnapped and trembling representatives he announced, in an almost inaudible voice, his gracious pardon to the workers for the crime which they imagined, and still believe, he himself had committed against them. And when they returned home, instead of finding their comrades released from prison, they learned that many others had been deprived of their liberty.

In the meantime the strike spread to other sections of society. Shop-assistants struck for more wages and shorter hours; the barbers in Moscow, domestic servants in Kieff, and apothecaries' assistants in both Russian capitals, ceased to work. More serious, more imposing, and productive of more excited discussion than any of these, was the strike of the students of all the higher educational institutions of Russia. In no country in the world has the extraordinary spectacle been seen of 50,000 students of all faculties refusing to attend university lectures, thereby sacrificing a fourth of their academic career and entering upon their professions a twelvemonth later, solely in order to express their condemnation of the existing régime and their deep sympathy with the

demands of the working-men. A large number of professors approved the students' movement; and public opinion upheld both teachers and scholars.

The students' strike bears the character of a purely political protest, and brings out in strong relief the essential significance of the working-men's agitation, which, chaotic and disorganised as it is, eludes precise definition. Roughly speaking, Gapon's petition presented the working men's chief needs in a form that corresponded to their semi-articulate desire. In that petition political demands were in the forefront; and they have remained in the forefront ever since. This was demonstrated very strikingly by the fate of the Shidloffsky Commission—a body of officials whom the Emperor charged with the task of studying the local labour problem and remedying the men's worst grievances at once. It was to consist of representatives of the Government, of the employers, and of the operatives. Senator Shidloffsky, an official whose record was unknown to the outside world, was appointed president; and notices were posted up in prominent positions inviting the operatives to choose electors who in turn would elect delegates to represent the working-men on the Commission. Workmen read, shrugged their shoulders, wondered, consulted, and finally agreed that it might be worth while to send electors as the authorities requested. But they took rigid precautions beforehand.

'You want us to elect comrades to speak for us?' said the men of the Putiloff works to the policemen who were urging them. 'That's all very well; but we must be careful. You see, we elected representatives who were to go before the Tsar, and you pounced upon them and put them in prison. They are still in gaol. How do we know that you will not imprison other spokesmen if we choose them?' The police saw the point, and, after some beating about the bush, promised that during the elections the men should be unmolested and their representatives should be secure against arrest. Then the difficult job of sifting began, a process which, little as the Government desired it, was simply a continuation of the course of political instruction that had been so successfully inaugurated on January 22. At the various mills and factories the 'hands' met in their workshops or in courtyards, and with all due formalities, including the ballot-box, indicated

the men from among whom were to be chosen their representatives on the Commission. The electors were to demand before everything freedom of association, freedom of assembly, and freedom to strike. The police hovered on the outskirts of the meetings; their spies were present within; but on the whole the authorities refrained from interference. The meetings presented an excellent opportunity for political agitation, of which the workmen's leaders took full advantage.

The proceedings at one such gathering—that held on a cold Sunday morning at the cartridge factory on Basil island—are typical of many. When the men assembled in the courtyard they found themselves under the surveillance of Cossacks and a body of police. 'You must go out of this yard,' said the men, 'or else we shall do no electing.' Cossacks and police accordingly left, after extorting a promise that the men would allow no outsiders to enter. As soon as the representatives of authority had vanished, eighteen individuals unbuttoned their overcoats and disclosed students' uniforms. They were greeted with shouts of welcome, which were subsequently turned to cries of anger, when it was discovered that the men were not students but police spies. Then they were roughly mauled and expelled without ceremony. Then speeches were made—speeches against the war speeches in favour of the war, speeches against the Government, and speeches in favour of the Government, speeches by Socialist revolutionaries, by Social Democrats, and by *agents provocateurs*. Finally, the *agents provocateurs* were eliminated by violent means. After that the Social Democrats placed before the assembly the irreducible minimum of the demands which the workmen ought to make to the Commission. These included, besides the points already mentioned, the release of their comrades who had been arrested at the time of the massacre. The assembly agreed that nothing less could be demanded; and the resolution was signed by practically every one present. Sheets of paper were hung up for the benefit of those who might wish to record their opposition to the demands; but, as a band of stalwart operatives stood ready to deal violently with any one who might attempt to sign, the white pages remained clean.

The first stage of the election having been traversed,

350 electors were to prepare for the next. On the first day they formed themselves into groups, according to the nature of their respective industries; on the second day they agreed to present their irreducible minimum of preliminary demands to Senator Shidloffsky, pointing out that, unless he granted these, they would refuse to proceed to the election of delegates. Senator Shidloffsky, on the third day, signified his inability to comply with the requests, and uttered a sufficiently clear warning that those who persisted in making political demands would be arrested. Thereupon the electors carried out their threat, refused to choose deputies, and inaugurated a fresh general strike, this time as a purely political demonstration. Though the strike did not become general, but retained the intermittent character that has been habitual since the day of the massacre, a government would be blind indeed that refused to see the menace to its own existence contained in this desperate effort to maintain passive resistance. Yet the Tsar's Government goes out of its way to provoke action. Hundreds of working-men have been arrested since then, and sent, together with criminals, through forwarding prisons to the places of their birth, where they must turn to agricultural labour, for which fifteen or twenty years' work in mills has unfitted them; while strikers who happen to be Jews are rejected by the employers, acting under the direction of the authorities. The Tsar's promise that the Shidloffsky Commission would relieve the workmen has been withdrawn, and the Commission itself dissolved.

Everywhere old needs have become articulate. The semblance of national unity that prevailed so long as 'order' of the kind affected by the autocracy could be maintained, has fallen away now that the stern hand of repression has perforce been relaxed. The silence that was construed to mean absolute cohesion has given place to a very babel of protests from all classes, professions, and races, that might seem to connote utter dissolution were it not for the fact that they all are directed against one object—the Government. Poles and Finns, Armenians and German Jews, Stundists and Old Believers, landed proprietors and peasants, nobles and commoners, employers of labour and working-men, merchants and artists, students and professors, academicians and doctors,

lawyers and men of letters, are all at one. There is hardly a class that has not joined in the insistent demand that the nation should be allowed to govern itself.

To this demand the Tsar and almost all the members of the dynasty resolutely demur. They are emboldened to uphold autocracy at all costs by a band of adherents whose motives are discredited by their antecedents, and whose methods would irremediably damage a truly noble cause. As these men, foremost among whom was the late Grand-duke Sergius, enjoy the fitful confidence of Nicholas II, and recoil from no means that may appear to them effective, the absolutist régime will presumably be maintained at home as Russian hegemony is being perpetuated abroad. If sacrifices of men and money can accomplish the feat, they will be made ungrudgingly.

But the bulk of the thinking classes, including many state dignitaries and some ministers, is profoundly convinced that the lowest cost of temporarily rescuing the autocracy from the dangers that now beset it would be ruinous to the nation. Hence they are partisans of reform. They know that until and unless this change is accomplished, neither law nor order nor security for property or life can be maintained in a realm which comprises one sixth of the habitable globe. Assassinations, massacres, the burning of manors, the devastation of estates, armed risings, successful insurrections, general strikes, and the unimaginable frenzy of benighted peasants whom famine has driven mad, are among the phenomena which will be associated with the present and last phase of one-man rule in Russia. It is painful to reflect that these abnormal conditions, and the untold misery which they inflict upon millions of innocent people, are the direct and indirect results of the action of a man to whom personal cruelty has never been brought home. And that impression is made more painful still by the reflection that a stroke of his pen would suffice to put an end to that widespread and acute suffering, and would at the same time bestow more real power upon himself as head of a constitutional régime than he ever possessed as a lonely autocrat. But it is to be feared that, left to himself, he will never discern the dilemma nor realise the necessity of choosing between the alternatives.

Every government reform, every administrative act

which has righted wrongs or alleviated misery during the past twelve months, has been wrung from the autocracy by dint of violence. In no recorded case has the Tsar taken the initiative; and he and his intimates, whose names the public has never heard, set themselves to circumscribe the action of ministers by creating accomplished facts. It was thus that the March manifesto was clandestinely written and illegally promulgated, and is now being iniquitously used by the rural clergy to inflame popular passions against the best sections of the people. That document, published in spite of the law, and without the knowledge of the Tsar's advisers, stung these to the quick and moved them to prompt action. The reform rescript was then literally wrung from the autocrat by ministers turned conspirators. It was a new version of a palace revolution, organised by loyal but indignant servants. Unless the same ministers are inspired by nobler motives to insist on its execution, Russia may be plunged in the horrors of a civil war, the accompaniments of which will cause Western peoples to shudder.

Nicholas II, whose character offers unplumbed depths to the psychologist, might perhaps not recoil from this extreme consequence; and such an issue seems to be rendered probable by his determination to continue the war with Japan. The Tsar is a law unto himself, and will remain so to the end. But it is questionable whether self-respecting ministers, whose duty is to advise and enlighten him, ought to countenance by their presence a policy which is subversive of rudimentary morality and productive of gigantic crime. The future historian will hardly offer an apology for the pusillanimity of officials who refused to ward off a national disaster when nothing more violent is needed than a ministerial strike. While it would be unfair summarily to condemn a monarch for firmness in resisting encroachment on his privileges or severity in repressing rebellion against the Crown, there is little to be said in favour of a prince who is blind to the consequences of misrule, and, both by his action and his inaction, is, to all appearance, hurrying his country to the brink of the abyss.

Art. XII.—WATTS AND WHISTLER.

It has been no small good fortune to Londoners to have had this winter three great exhibitions open at the same time, which, by their juxtaposition, emphasised so many points of contrast and together symbolised so clearly the close of a period in modern art. During the last quarter of the nineteenth century the art represented in these three galleries has been as stimulating, as vehemently canvassed, and often as violently decried as any. Now, for the first time, even those who took a share in the discussions of the day can look at what our age produced with a steadier gaze, and can say what they feel without fear of offence and without the exaggerated fervour of partisanship. It is true that some of the great men of the French Impressionist school are still happily alive; but their battles are over, they have entered into their heritage of fame; and it is possible even to some who have always opposed their aims to recognise their achievement as simply and unhesitatingly as if they had been old masters. What that achievement was we do not intend to discuss here; but it will be impossible, in talking of Watts and Whistler, to avoid occasional glances at contemporary art in France by way of contrast and comparison. For, if we take Watts and Whistler as in some ways typical of English art, we are at once struck by their extraordinary unlikeness, while in the French group, in spite of vivid contrasts of temperament, we find a tendency to formulate a common style, to fight a common battle, and to combine forces in a 'movement.'

The French, with all their supposed 'intransigence,' their theoretical love of revolution, are in many ways more traditional than we are. The tradition of Ingres lives in Degas; and how far back through Poussin does not that take us? It would be almost impossible to find a French artist who renounces Poussin and Claude; while, among contemporaries, the opportunities of friendly intercourse are better cultivated, the solidarity of all genuine workers is more readily acknowledged. On the other hand, the characteristics of a nation with a hundred creeds and only one sauce make themselves felt even in our art. Our individualism is so innate and so extreme

that our great men tend to isolate themselves from any close spiritual intercourse with their kindred. Like Watts, they go their own way so directly and so unconscious of their lonely progress that they do not even proclaim their dissent; or, like Whistler, they find in their isolation at once a source of inspiration, by the sense of superiority it gives, and of irritation, so that they cry aloud the grounds of their disagreement.

Our English masters, then—and after all Whistler was more English than French—are alike only in their segregation. And indeed Whistler will be found to agree less with the French Impressionists than Watts does; for the French painters loved life, and they followed nature with an almost pathetic faith; and Watts, though from quite a different approach, also had a sympathy for life and a reverence for nature. For him, too, art was an organic part of human life, affected by its conditions and expressive of its needs. But Whistler's creed was absolute and unbending. He asserted the unique nature of the sense of beauty, its uselessness, its separation from all other human faculties, and its supreme claims.

Whistler, the pamphleteer, the journalist, the dandy, the pugnacious litigant, was always in evidence. One might have supposed then that here at least was the man who, loving publicity and the stir of city life, would have been able to say, in a sparkling and witty idiom of his own, something about life. Even if he had not interpreted its deeper significance, we might have expected from him some close and convincing statement of its fashions and its follies. But no artist ever shrank from life more than Whistler. No one approached it with more haughty and self-contained reserve. He was never really on terms with life; his keen intelligence made him alert to detect fallacies in the proverbial philosophies of his day, and his corrosive wit made his exposure of them bitterly resented. He became a negative Mephistophelian figure; his geniality shrivelled, his sympathies were crushed both from within and from without. But the very fastidiousness of taste, both intellectual and æsthetic, which thus set him in opposition to life prevented him from giving vent, as a Swift or Carlyle, to the rage of his heart. The fire burned within him, but he spoke only ephemeral witticisms in the press;

he never painted the satires that he conceived; for the root of all his quarrel with life lay in the one really deep emotion he possessed—the love of pure beauty.

If there be such a thing as a religion of beauty, Whistler was its hierophant. To an unbelieving and sentimental generation he proclaimed its severe and unaccommodating dogmas with all the paradoxical insolence of a true prophet. The world laughed; and the terrible irony of his situation lay in the fact that, on the main issue, a stupidly emotional world was right and the prophet wrong. For beauty cannot exist by itself; cut off from life and human realities it withers. It must send its roots down into other layers of human consciousness and be fed from imaginatively apprehended truth, as in religious art, or from human sympathy, as in dramatic art, or from a sense of human needs and fears in the face of nature, as in all great landscape art. But Whistler, like Oscar Wilde—who was in some ways a similar product of the same moment in modern life—wanted beauty to be self-contained and self-sufficing. In both there was something heroic, in the insolent haughtiness of the protest they made, in their refusal to come to terms with the common intelligence of the age, in their demand for martyrdom. Wilde, as 'De Profundis' has so eloquently proved, did, through the revelation of pain, learn the truth of humility, the artistic meaning of sorrow, but Whistler, embittered and saddened though he was, was never forced to amplify his theories.

His theory, then, that the æsthetic emotion is entirely distinct and self-sufficient, made it a point of honour for him to eliminate from his painting all that indignation with a gross generation which might conceivably have inspired in him an art of terrible denunciation like Daumier's. His fiery and militant spirit concentrated itself on the perfection of beauty, on the search for it in its purest aspects, where its elements could be seized apart from any possible meanings they might connote. He made almost a fetish of the artistic conscience. His negations and exclusions became more and more exacting, his points of contact with life rarer. In his early picture of the 'Piano,' objects have their solid relief; they are enveloped in a warm atmosphere; the figures live and are capable of motion and tender human feeling. But, in the

face of all that had beset English art, and was once again, with the waning of Preraphaelitism and the growing ascendancy of Millais, overwhelming it in a flood of commonplace sentiment and obvious narrative, Whistler became more and more Quixotic in his chivalrous defence of the artist's point of honour. Real beauty, he recognised, must be always something medicinal to the mass of mankind; and he protested against diluting the drug with sugar and water, against any attempt at making it immediately palatable. For beauty of a striking and original kind has always, at least since the *bourgeoisie* ruled, appeared in the light of a personal insult.

It is now unintelligible to us that Whistler's Nocturnes should have appeared to spectators in the seventies meaningless or chaotic; to us their language is as simple as Tennyson's; but the generation that found 'In Memoriam' hopelessly difficult, found neither sky nor water nor bridge in Whistler's 'Battersea by Night.' Nor could they pass it by unheeded; to them it was the impudent imposture of a charlatan. When we blame Whistler—and his later life was calculated often to exasperate his most generous admirers—we ought to remember what the shock must have been to a man who saw in his own Nocturnes all that we now see, and who heard them derided by the leading critics of the day, by Tom Taylor and Ruskin, and by all the shouting mob. He was 'Athanasius contra mundum'; he hardened his heart and circumscribed the limits of the artist's faith, making his creed narrow, pedantic, and inhuman.

The creed was exposed once and for all in Swinburne's eloquent reply to the 'Ten o'clock'; but Whistler never consciously gave it up, and he worked on the assumption that beauty existed in and for itself. He believed that design meant a perfectly harmonised pattern, that certain colour combinations pleased the eye more intensely than others. He refused to see that the mere beauty of a pattern could be heightened if it were at once a pattern and a drama, that the chord of colour would vibrate more richly to the eye if at the same time it woke an echo in the imagination. For him a picture was a flattened-out porcelain jar, in which we look primarily for the highest and most subtle stimulus to a sense of sight, trained by long apprenticeship to appreciate the most delicate per-

fections of quality. He realised Taste in its highest development. For him it became no mere casual predilection, but a separate and highly refined activity, which, if not actually a function of the intellect, implied at least a constant discrimination and selection, and required a disinterested effort similar to that of intellectual apprehension. For its perfection it required too a scrupulosity and *ascesis* which made it analogous to moral purity. He carried it about with him as a prophylactic against the contaminations of a vulgar age; he lived by it as a religious by his rule; he almost sank the genius in the man of taste.

He showed it, too, in a certain scrupulous exactitude and finish in the minor affairs of life. The world could not but recognise that he left a stamp of completeness upon the most trivial and casual affairs. He showed it, for instance, when, some few years ago, he was asked to contribute to the show of old silver held at the Fine Art Society's in Bond Street. The whole show-case in which he had confided his treasures expressed the man almost as clearly as a picture by him. Collectors generally reveal something of themselves in what they gather round them, but much remains inexpressive, the result of the mere chances of the market or the desire to get what is acclaimed as authentic; but Whistler seemed to have himself designed every one of the pieces, a hundred years old or more, which he showed. So rigorous had been the selection, so exclusive the choice, that what remained was pure Whistler; it had his sense of proportion, his austere elegance, his unmistakable perfection.

For Whistler, then, this educated discrimination which we call taste was the great artistic function; and this he found exemplified in the art of the Far East as nowhere else, with the doubtful exception of Greece. There, in China and Japan, the tact and self-restraint that taste implies were almost national characteristics; and Whistler's importance for the art of Europe consists not a little in his introduction of Japanese canons. It may even be that the difference between the disgust with which his 'Battersea Bridge' was once received and the enthusiasm it now arouses is due to the fact that, in the meanwhile, we have become accustomed to the Japanese angle of vision. Certain it is that what was most original in

Whistler's art was in part due to his powers, not as a creator, but as a connoisseur. He discovered, not Battersea Bridge, but the Bridge of Kioto; and Hiroshige, rather than nature, taught him the perfect harmonies of his Nocturnes.

We are at last beginning to treat the classic art of China and Japan with the same reverence that we have long extended to Greek art. But as, in the case of Greek art, pioneers like Winckelmann worshipped Græco-Roman copies that we now despise, so Whistler stopped at the threshold to admire as the authentic divinity the comparatively trifling and decadent work of later Japanese artists. To us for whom, thanks in part to Whistler himself, roads have been opened up in this new country, it is now clear that, in the great classic art of China and Japan, design does not mean mere agreeableness of pattern, but embraces that perpetual play of two motives—the motive of form as a delight to the eye, and of form as directly expressive of moods and images to the feelings and the intelligence.

It was partly through Rossetti, that great explorer of new kingdoms of delight, that Whistler was started upon his quest of Oriental beauty; and, having once started, he went to lengths which brought him into opposition with Preraphaelite doctrines; for he came to side with the Eastern artist as against the Western in his views upon relief. It is this perhaps more than anything else which made him so singular, so isolated a figure in the art of the nineteenth century. For the West has always loved to give to its painted images the utmost possible effect of solid relief. The Greeks knew the joy of this power of relief and used it, if we may trust their critics, for the vulgarest effects of illusion, as in Theon's picture of the hoplite; and the love of relief in painting is endemic in the West, for the whole art of the Renaissance shows a continual struggle with the rebellious flatness of the painted surface. But the Eastern artist has always felt that the proprieties of an art of design on the flat demanded a more symbolic treatment; that relief in painting is a vulgar emphasis by the artist on that which the mind of the spectator is supposed to embody in response to his delicate indications. We need not decide here which is right; the Western ideal is

certainly more difficult, and more dangerous, in that it lets in more non-æsthetic elements, and may, in fact, obscure the whole meaning of the art of design; but, at the same time, it may lead to more imposing, more irresistible triumphs.

In any case, Whistler took sides definitely with the East, and, in the middle of a society which was enamoured of the crudest actuality in art, insisted on painting large pictures in oils like the 'Mother' and the 'Carlyle,' the whole point of which was the negation of relief, the reduction of the figure to its value as a flat scarcely modelled silhouette. And how exquisitely the silhouette is elaborated! Who but Whistler would have thought of getting what he did out of Carlyle, letting the coat fly open at the breast, buttoning it tight round the hips in a way which threatens to turn Carlyle into his own 'Dandiacal Body,' throwing out the hand as an embroidery of the line. As pure pattern it is a masterpiece; and with what subtlety too is the substance of the paint wrought so as to become at once lovely in itself and subordinate to the desired flatness. Whistler once said to an artist whose water-colours he admired, 'Why don't you paint in oils?' The artist replied, 'I don't know how. I have no technique.' To which Whistler answered, 'Nor have I. Do as I do: paint oils like water-colours.' And this is true. In his early pieces, like the 'Piano' or the 'Building of Westminster Bridge,' he used paint for its relief-values, for the expressiveness of rich impasto and transparent shade; but, after he had once conceived the idea that the flat silhouette was the highest expression of pictorial design, he painted with an even thinness; and pictures such as the 'Mother' and the 'Carlyle' are in fact *gouaches* done in oil. For this purpose he developed a technique of thin lacquered surfaces which has rare beauty and of which he alone knew the secret.

But taste, which thus led him to refine on life and reject its invitations, however chaste, is, like asceticism, a negative and cloistered virtue; and its too exclusive cultivation led Whistler to expose himself to his enemies, led him even to justify in some sort their accusations. He arrived at the point where the calligraphy of his celebrated signature came to seem almost a sufficient assertion of his power. So that in many of his litho-

graphs and not a few of the later etchings he gives us only a few brilliant scratches just sufficiently adumbrating a scene in Venice or a blacksmith's forge at Lyme. Worst, and most pathetic of all, the calligraphy of his strokes is here no longer superlative; and not only is the execution slight, but too often the idea is trivially pretty or utterly banal.

What comes out for us most at the present time is the isolation of Whistler. People were fond of calling him an impressionist, and so, in a sense, he was, in that he tried to confine himself to the visual impression, to exclude from his work the associated ideas of objects. But the gulf which separates him from men like Degas, Monet, and Renoir, is immense. They nod recognition to Watts behind Whistler's back, for they are all interested in life, ironically, scientifically, or lyrically, as their temperaments incline. They may protest that they hate literary art, and class Watts as a *littérateur*; but their pictures belie them. Whole pages of Zola are in Degas' 'Washer-women'; a story by de Maupassant is in every Renoir; and Watts is so far of their company that, in his grandiose abstract manner, he too felt the warm attraction of human life, he too interpreted, though through the thicker veils of English convention, something of that femininity which inspired Renoir. But Whistler stands alone untouched by the imitations of life, protesting that beauty exists apart, that the work of man's hands is fairer than all that nature can show. He is a monument to the power of the artist's creed in its narrowest interpretations, and to the unbending rectitude of the artistic conscience, a lonely, scarcely a lovable, but surely an heroic figure.

Watts presents at almost every point the completest contrast to Whistler. His temperamental optimism grew and expanded in the atmosphere of distinguished and aristocratic life with which he was surrounded. The shocks and disillusionments of life were powerless to affect it; he clung always with a genial pertinacity to what was hopeful and elevating. He was positive and generous where Whistler was negative and cynical. His easily kindled enthusiasm for what was noble silenced the critical and discriminating faculties of the intellect. Where Whistler was moved to scornful indignation by

the hasty assumptions of a superficial and facile philosophy, by the easy-going generalisations which were current at the time, Watts's imagination responded with glowing enthusiasm. For this aspect of his character the 'Hope,' hackneyed and commonplace as it now appears to many of us, is indeed admirably expressive of the central fact of his temperament—of its irreducible optimism, its illogical and instinctive clinging to what is exhilarating and consoling to the spirit, its refusal to recognise the reality of what is adverse to its aspirations. To his genial, assimilative nature the harsh abstraction of Whistler's artistic Calvinism, with its insistence on perfection, had no meaning. For him perfection, as the result of deliberate and critical choice, of rejection and exclusion, had no attractions. He created by inclusion and absorption, by identifying himself with some great and elevating idea which gathered to itself, as it grew, what was necessary to its sustenance, careless even if it included some accidental and unnecessary accretions.

We are not, then, to look to Watts for perfection; each picture of his was a struggle to express some idea which stirred his emotions. He was bound to be experimental and tentative in his efforts to find for this the expressive symbol. And the very importance of the ideas to him, the high duty which he believed lay upon him to utter them to the world, prevented him from a curious preoccupation with the mode of their embodiment. So that, beside the clear-cut perfection of some of Whistler's designs, Watts's work must often seem hasty and unfinished.

If we stand before one of Reynolds's greater portrait groups and admire the matchless skill of design which it displays, and ask ourselves if Watts could have done thus, we must almost certainly answer no. And yet Reynolds refused to attempt the grand style as beyond his powers. Where Reynolds hesitated Watts stepped in. He, almost alone of English artists, if we except Haydon's forlorn hope, and Stevens' too rare essays, has attempted the grand style, and on its highest planes. Was he justified? That is the question that posterity will answer; we can hardly do more than make a plausible forecast. But we may say already with confidence that, whether he attained complete success or not, there was nothing arrogant or

absurd in his endeavour. There is nothing to make us think that Watts might have cultivated to perfection some little circumscribed plot, that he ever mistook his vocation, or sacrificed a small talent in the endeavour to make it a great one. His spirit moved at ease in a large orbit; his ears were attuned to majestic strains; he had to be grandiose or nothing. He had to be grandiose, moreover, in an inopportune age. To have been a second Michelangelo in the nineteenth century he would have needed far more than Michelangelo's genius. The attempt might have seemed altogether too hazardous if Watts had had a clearer understanding of its difficulty; fortunately he seems to have lived by the dictates of a sound instinct rather than by self-conscious theories.

Immense as the difficulties were, it is not well to exaggerate them. His age was one in which painting in this country sank to its lowest depths; but, for all that, it was really more propitious, or, let us say, less unpropitious, for this particular essay than some others. Painting in Reynolds's time was far better understood; there was a sound tradition of technique, a general elevation of taste; but, for all that, Reynolds may have been right to refrain, and Watts, less accomplished, less perfectly equipped as a painter, right to attempt. For the imaginative temper of the eighteenth century was too slack to prevent the grandiose from degenerating into the turgid and rhetorical. Reynolds's own attempts are a sufficient proof; but between Reynolds and Watts came Blake, Shelley, Wordsworth, Keats, and thence such an intensifying and rekindling of the poetic sense as made the grandiose no longer seem a dangerous affectation. Even the scientific movement of the Victorian age, while it made life uglier and diminished the artist's opportunities, did in fact help this enlargement of the mental horizon. It was, after all, a great age, and might well inspire here and there one generous soul to attempt great things in art also. In all humility and all seriousness Watts made the attempt; that, at least, is a part of the inspiration of his life-work.

No one could enter the galleries at Burlington House without feeling that here was the impress of a great spirit, that this work was inspired by a great and noble ambition, in which anything like self-assertion and

bravura was cast out by a higher pride. The classic amplitude of the movements, the heroic self-possession and repose of these figures, implied a creator who had succeeded in living in a serener atmosphere than belonged to his time. This is indeed the great mystery of Watts's work—not that he did not paint as Michelangelo or Titian, but that he succeeded in expressing himself in the grand style at all. That in an age of exasperating and nervous activity, greeted on all sides by the jerky briskness of the modern man, in an age of daily increasing ugliness and squalor, he did not despair of humanity; that he could still think of the human form as capable of large and stately gesture, of grave and lofty mien; that he could express once more the pagan ideal of perfect individuals and forget the alert cunning of the man of business—this was success beyond anticipation.

As we passed round the walls and traced his career from his earliest days, we followed with something of the interest of a romance the innumerable dangers which Watts encountered, the hair-breadth escapes, the perilous temptations, and the happy ending of each chapter. Every false canon of taste lay in wait for Watts. There was the primness and respectability of early Victorian life; and he painted one portrait that might pass for the work of any of the nameless dullards of the period. There was the theatre; and in the 'Watchman' and 'Ophelia' one may guess how nearly its cheap sentimentality caught him in its toils. There was always the attraction of fashionable prettiness; and the society in which he lived must have pressed its claims upon him with some exigence. Then the Preraphaelites must have tempted his generous sympathies to share their struggle, their triumphs, and their collapse; finally, his own idealism, the immense importance he attached to vague and nebulous theorising, again and again brought his art to the verge of incoherency. But even from that he recovered; and his latest works have firm, well ascertained designs, a deliberate and calculated geometry.

What was it that saved him? Not the society he kept; for he was surrounded by adulation enough to have killed a dozen ordinary geniuses; nor did he seek the society of men whose criticism might have braced him and turned back his vagrant fancy. Scarcely his intel-

lect, for this seems always to have been subordinate to his emotions. His worship of Titian, Veronese, and the Elgin marbles seems to have been his salvation; and this came about by reason of his robust good sense, his instinctive belief in the rightness and nobility of all the functions of the complete man, in short his paganism. Against this, all that was warped, one-sided, neurotic, or merely ephemeral, appealed in vain. All his idealism, all his speculations about the soul, never made him doubt the importance of the body; and it was the healthy vigour of this creed that saved him from the aberrations of an intellect that may often have been caught by specious sophistries. Fortunately he had the sense to trust his instincts, and to these he always returned. It was indeed the beautiful simplicity and absence of ostentation of his character that enabled him to do this; and it is in this sense true that his art is moral. We feel instinctively that the mind which conceived these heroic figures was moved by no petty vanities, was accustomed to generous and sympathetic impulses.

That other sense of his work being didactic, of which so much has been made both for and against, may be set down at once as an amiable and not altogether unfortunate delusion. Both the praise and the blame which Watts has received on this score seem to be the result of confusion. The praise, so curiously like that which Browning received from earnest souls, who, if they had read him with more understanding, ought rather to have been shocked, implied that Watts's greatness consisted in his power of making a rebus in paint of certain moral platitudes which could have been put more concisely in words, such, for instance, as that 'Love is the chief support of Life,' or that 'Love cannot postpone the day of Death.' Those who blamed were equally at fault in that they likewise assumed that the content of the pictures was only such as could be conveyed by these bald literary statements.

But the accusation that they were literature and not painting is not really justified. It might be urged, perhaps, against such symbolism as Mr Sargent employed in his decorations for the Boston Public Library. There there is a sun-god from which emerge rays ending each one in a hand. Now this is a symbol which can have no

direct meaning for a modern man; it can only touch him if it is explained by means of literary annotation; but the point of most of Watts's pictures requires no such annotation. The symbolism is, as a rule, of broad universal acceptance; it belongs to our popular mythology; and, whereas rays ending in hands cannot possibly arouse any emotions unless we have the clue to their meaning, most of Watts's allegories readily yield nearly all their pictorial and imaginative significance.

There are, it may be admitted, exceptions to this statement. There are cases—the 'Dweller in the Innermost' may be taken as an example—in which Watts, refusing the assistance of any recognised personifications of abstract ideas, endeavoured to externalise directly the nebulous and formless metaphysical notions in which he indulged. There is no reason to suppose that these were ever clear in his own mind, much less that he ever conceived them sufficiently clearly to find for them definite visual symbols. In such works he becomes mystical merely by being misty. The language of art, being formal, cannot hope to transcend the material by becoming formless, but only by the discovery of forms which symbolise the spiritual. But, for the most part, Watts's allegories do convey a definite idea in purely pictorial language by relying on the associated ideas of the objects represented; and these ideas gain immensely in their appeal to the emotions by the manner in which they are rendered, that is to say, by purely pictorial and not literary elements in the work of art. In fact, the objection to literary art, if pressed, would rule out all the ready-made material of the imaginative life, would exclude representations of biblical scenes and all dramatic and historical painting, and would confine us to renderings of things actually seen.

At the same time it may be allowed that Watts's allegorical pictures are not as a rule his best. They are for the most part rather thin in design; the lines tend to repeat a weakly, sinuous curve; they lack the vigour and antithesis and the firm geometry that we find in pictures where the subject supplies more definite material to his imagination. So that, among the creatively imaginative works, exclusive, that is, of portraiture and landscape, Watts's great triumph lies in what used to be

called historical painting. One or two of his biblical scenes will stand out as memorable interpretations, such, for instance, as the 'Prodigal Son' and the nobly dramatic composition of the 'Jacob and Esau.' Among these we would scarcely venture to put the 'Jonah,' one of the rare cases in which theatrical traditions imposed themselves upon his sentiment for the dramatic.

But it is in his interpretations of classical mythology that the finest, most central qualities of Watts's genius find expression. That, after Titian and Veronese had had their say, he could still conceive a Europa which, if not so great as Titian's, is not only original but more near to what one may fancy of Apelles or Zeuxis than either, more entirely in the Greek spirit and yet not without a modern tenderness and sympathy; that he should have given us an Ariadne which is essentially Greek in design, but yet interprets the story for us again more humanely, more intimately than ever before, a Psyche that counts with Keats's ode to make good the lack of 'antique vows,' and a 'Childhood of Zeus' which has some breath of Olympian air—to have done this will ensure a lasting fame, even if future ages should refuse to disentangle the meaning of his more abstract allegories.

Watts was so many-sided in his activity that it is impossible here to discuss more than the general aspects of his genius. That he devoted so much of his energy to portraiture was not of his own choice. He wanted to be a decorative designer, to cover the walls of our public buildings with frescos expressive of national and public themes. Two figures, 'The Sisters,' and the 'Story from Boccaccio' at the Tate Gallery, show what he might have done had his wish been granted. We may even believe that, had he spent his life on work which demands above all else a design built up on firmly asserted contours, that vagueness of modelling and incompleteness of content, which just prevents his work from attaining the highest level, would have disappeared. Fresco being denied him, he found that the only great service he could render to the nation lay in portraiture.

Watts's portraits are coloured by this sense of a public function. They show no great psychological penetration. There is no intimate revelation of character; his sitters appear rather in the character they had for their age;

they are what we might expect of them ; they are never revealed to us suddenly in a new and unexpected light, by which we recognise their real essence. But, for all that, they live, not intensely, not in any close personal way, but in their public capacity, bearing on their faces the stamp of their office. A few of them, moreover, are of surpassing beauty both in colour and quality ; among the finest we might name the 'Joachim,' the 'Lord Shrewsbury,' and the 'Recorder of London.' These indeed may be taken as the completest refutation of the idea that Watts could not paint well. The fact is that no one of our time has known so much as Watts of the technical possibilities of paint, or has mastered more various and more difficult manners. Scarcely any of the methods of the earlier masters was unfamiliar to him. The glowing enamel-like quality of the 'Aurora,' which reminds one of French painting of the eighteenth century ; the heavy glazes and loaded impasto of the 'Joachim,' which reminds us of Reynolds and Rembrandt ; the constant reminiscences of the technique of Titian and Veronese, show that it was certainly not incompetence that led Watts finally to adopt that rocky, dry, and crumbled quality which has given rise to the curious legend of his incompetence. Even in these later works, unsympathetic though their surface may be, he shows incomparable skill, using these dry rubbings and scumblings of pigment so as to produce colour which has mystery and infinity, and, most wonderful of all, transparency ; so that when, last year, he showed one of his latest works, the 'Lilian,' at the Academy, it turned everything else there by comparison to opaque and discoloured dullness.

Watts's work as a landscape painter, though he did comparatively little, is by no means the least remarkable of what he has left, for he shows here a surprising originality. He is indeed almost the only modern landscape painter of consequence who has beaten out entirely new paths and found his way to real compositions, not mere transcripts of nature, without unconsciously rendering homage to Claude. He found the way to treat landscape with a new simplicity, to abstract more completely, and to reduce his theme to a few elements and one main contrast of tone. He treats thus a cumulus cloud cut by the bare edge of a hill or the gaunt silhouette

of a mountain peak; or he makes his picture of the portrait of a single tree-trunk; or, most remarkable of all, he renders a distant, mist-enveloped prospect and obtains relief without any of the recognised means, without *repoussoirs* or strongly contrasted foregrounds. In these landscapes he shows the power of fixing on one idea, of getting the central emotion of the scene, and rendering that and that only without any explanatory accessories. In no other work does he show a higher power of concentration. And this concentration is the result of the imaginative intensity with which he has grasped the significance, for him, of the landscape.

We may return now to the question with which we started, the attempt to forecast Watts's position among the great artists of the world. The difficulty is, in his case, far greater than with Whistler, for Whistler accomplished something which had never been done before, accomplished it finally and definitively. It is something palpable and evident, but it scarcely claims the very highest rank. But Watts calls up perpetually the memory of the greatest creators, of Michelangelo, of Titian, of Rubens; and, if we are perfectly frank, his work will not quite stand the test thus inevitably applied. This explains, no doubt, the frequent change of attitude which even those who sincerely admire Watts undergo, now feeling that he is among the Olympians, and now confessing to a shy but persistent doubt. We have endeavoured to consider the grounds on which Watts's achievement is to be judged; as yet it would be unwise to do more than hazard a personal opinion as to the conclusion to be drawn. To the present writer it seems that Watts belongs to the race of the great improvisers, the race to which Tintoretto, Blake, and El Greco belong, rather than to the race of the supreme creators, the kindred of Titian or Rubens whom he emulated. The distinction lies in this, that the great creators revealed some new aspect of form, and discovered some new rhythm. They expressed great conceptions in forms moulded anew specially to fit them, while the improvisers modified and adapted to the expression of their own conceptions material that had already been quarried.

In the artists of both classes we find an extraordinary wealth of invention; images pass perpetually across their

inward vision; but with the improvisers these crowd upon one another so rapidly that the artist's whole energy is devoted to recording their general aspect. In the supreme creative designers, in Michelangelo, Titian, or Rubens, there was greater control over the images; they could be held long enough and securely enough for the artist to embody them more completely; and, most important of all, they allowed of a greater content. Michelangelo and Titian, in particular, were able to come to close terms with nature without weakening the unity of their idea. They could observe with penetrating insight and fill out the design to its utmost extent, straining the scheme with the mass of material it was made to contain, but never breaking it by casual, indifferent, or curious statements. Watts stopped short of this penetrating intelligence of form. He felt keenly the main scaffolding of his design, the weight and protrusion of a limb, the curve of a torso; and thus far he is not only noble, grandiose, and impressive, but masterly; but he could not go on to fill out the main masses with a content expressive throughout its whole texture. The design in its main lines is almost always grand, but it is not compactly woven. With him generalisation means too often abstraction.

To make a form that shall be generalised and typical, not merely particular and individual, implies in an artist great imagination; to give to this form the same cogency and completeness that can be given to some rendering of the particular, to realise its infinity and variety as fully as its unity—this is, after all, the supreme problem of the grand style; and the fact that it so far exceeds in difficulty and impressiveness all other artistic performances is the reason why we give almost divine honours to the few who have attained to it. Watts and Puvis de Chavannes are the only artists of our day who have laid serious claims to these honours. Their canonisation may be deferred; but an age and country are illustrious that have produced even one claimant.

ROGER E. FRY.

Art. XIII.—THE UNEMPLOYED.

1. *Report on Agencies and Methods for dealing with Unemployed made to the Board of Trade, 1893.* [C. 7182.]
 2. *Reports of Select Committees of the House of Commons upon Distress from want of Employment.* Commons Papers, iii, 253 and 365 of 1895, 321 of 1896.
 3. *Report of the Mansion House Committee, 1904.* Printed by Penny and Hull, Leman Street, Whitechapel.
 4. *Report to Board of Trade on Agencies, etc., for dealing with the Unemployed in Foreign Countries.* By D. F. Schloss. 1904. [Cd. 2304.]
 5. *Report of the Special Committee of the London Charity Organisation Society, 1905.* Denison House, S.W.
 6. *Chalmers on Charity; a selection of passages, etc.* Edited by N. Masterman. London: Constable, 1900.
 7. *Modern Methods of Charity.* By C. R. Henderson and others. New York and London: Macmillan, 1904.
 8. *Co-operative Small Holdings.* By R. Winfrey. The Co-operative Small Holdings Association, 10 Adelphi Terrace, W.C., 1904.
 9. *The Unemployed: a National Question.* By Percy Alden. With Preface by Sir J. Gorst. London: King, 1905.
 10. *The Old Poor-law.* By F. C. Montagu. Republished by the London Charity Organisation Society, 1905.
- And other works and reports.

THE announcement in the King's speech of prospective legislation to create 'permanent machinery' to deal with the unemployed, or, in other words, of a change in the law affecting the relief of the able-bodied poor, has been accepted with complacency by the general public as an instalment of that 'poor-law reform' of which we hear so much. It will be received with serious apprehension by most of those who have concerned themselves with the study and practice of poor-law administration. At the moment that this is written the actual proposals of the Government have not been published, but it is sufficiently intimated that they will be upon the lines of Mr Long's scheme, which undertakes to find employment relief through the rates, but outside the poor law. The fact that permanent legislation is now contemplated upon the basis of an experiment which has had only some three months' trial is not in itself reassuring. As an

exceptional measure to meet an exceptional occasion that scheme was comparatively innocuous, though there were some who at the time expressed doubt as to the occasion being really exceptional, and as to the wisdom of the scheme itself. Now, however, that we are told that it will become part of the 'permanent machinery' of the State, the position is altered. We shall hear, of course, that the machinery is only intended for exceptional occasions; but we may be sure that, when once it is there, it will not be allowed to rust for want of use.

But, whatever the intentions of the Government may be, it is time that the public should recognise the direction in which we are drifting with regard to the whole question. Political memory is short, and there are few to whom study of poor-laws is congenial. It may be permissible, therefore, to tread for a while upon rather well-worn ground, and to recall the fact that it is not many years since the State actually possessed 'permanent machinery' for the purpose of giving work to the unemployed, or, as it was then termed, 'setting the poor to work.' There are doubtless a few still living who had experience of those times in their childhood. There must be many who have heard of them at first hand from the generation preceding them. It is but two or three years since the death of the Rt Hon. C. P. Villiers, who was one of the assistant commissioners to the Royal Commission of 1834. The 'Quarterly Review' itself was of respectable age at the time of the passing of the Poor-law Amendment Act, and took no inconsiderable part in the discussion.

For nearly three hundred years, down to 1834, the State had accepted the duty of finding work. There had been at times a swing of the pendulum. Defoe protested against it in his 'petition to Parliament,' pointing out that the State, in giving work to one, only takes it away from another. In 1697 there was a temporary reaction in favour of institutional relief in workhouses 'as a best means of restraining idleness,' and workhouses were accordingly built at Bristol and other places; but generally speaking the tendency was in the other direction. Finally, in 1782, it was provided—

'That no person shall be sent to the poorhouse except such as become indigent by age or infirmities, and are unable to

acquire a maintenance by their labour'; further, 'where there shall be in any parish, township, or place, any poor person or persons who shall be able or willing to work, but who cannot get employment, the guardian of the poor of such parish, etc., is required to agree for the labour of such poor person or persons at any work or employment suited to his or her strength and capacity, near the place of his or her residence.'

That Act remained in force for about fifty years, until the conditions became no longer endurable.

In 1832 Lord Althorp promised a Royal Commission upon the whole subject, and its report was published in 1834. 'That report,' says Dr Aschrott, 'is a masterly example of a thorough, comprehensive, and unbiassed enquiry.' The Commissioners 'took evidence from every county, and almost every town, and from many villages.'

'It is now our painful duty' (they say) 'to report that the fund which the 43rd Elizabeth directed to be employed in setting to work children and persons capable of labour, is applied to purposes opposed to the letter and, still more, to the spirit of that law, and destructive to the morals of the most numerous class and to the welfare of all.'

Their chief conclusion was that outdoor relief to the able-bodied poor 'in kind or money, without labour, or an aid of labour by the allowance system, the roundsman system, or parish employment,' was the great source of abuse; their chief recommendation, that 'all relief to the able-bodied, otherwise than in well-regulated workhouses, shall cease,' and that thenceforward the position of the pauper should be less eligible than that of the independent labourer.

The Poor Law Amendment Act was carried, and under exceptional conditions. Parliament had been reformed, but the franchise was still a narrow one. Both parties were agreed. The Duke of Wellington, the leader of the Opposition, described the Act as one of the most valuable and courageous measures ever proposed by a Government. Within fifty years, whilst outdoor relief to the able-bodied had been abolished, the workhouses were almost emptied of able-bodied poor. Sir G. Nicholls, writing twenty years later, says: 'No one now doubts the pernicious effect of artificial employment, or is blind to the consequences of tampering with the market for labour,

whether by the parish or in any other way.' Mr Gladstone, writing in 1897, says:—

'In 1834 the Government, and Lord Althorp far beyond all others, did themselves high honour by the new Poor Law Act, which rescued the English peasantry from the total loss of their independence.' ('Life,' vol. i, p. 115.)

After that there was enormous improvement in the condition of the people. Wages, no longer subsidised by the rates, took an upward turn: working-class savings and accumulations multiplied and increased. Apart from crises such as the Manchester cotton famine, which were dealt with by exceptional and temporary measures, the improvement was continuous. There have, it is true, been fluctuations in trade, fluctuations which will always have to be reckoned with in a commercial community; but hitherto they have been met partly by the reserves and accumulations of the working classes themselves, and partly by the operation of philanthropic effort and the reformed poor-law.

In 1886 Mr Chamberlain issued the well-known circular to Boards of Guardians, in which was the germ of a new departure. In it the President, after setting out, in the most precise language, the law for the relief of the able-bodied, and deprecating any departure from it as tending 'to restore the condition of things which, before the reform of the poor-laws, destroyed the independence of the working classes,' proceeds to recommend that work, by way of relief, should be found 'for artisans and others who have hitherto avoided poor-law assistance,' through the vestries, and outside the poor-law altogether. The work to be found is work which 'will not involve the stigma of pauperism, work which all can perform, whatever their previous avocations, and which will not compete with labourers already in employment'—conditions sufficiently difficult of fulfilment. The circular was doubtless intended to apply only to an exceptional occasion. In fact, however, it has been regarded as giving a sanction to the habitual provision of relief-work; and the lower class of labour has learnt to demand this as a right.

In 1892 the circular was again issued by Sir Henry Fowler. In the same year a valuable report upon agencies and methods for dealing with the unemployed

was issued by the Board of Trade. That report points out the ambiguity of the phrase 'unemployed,' which 'covers a problem of considerable complexity.' It describes the various agencies existing both in England and abroad. It includes historical memoranda as to 'parish employment under the old poor-law,' and the *ateliers municipaux* of 1848. Of farm colonies, it says that foreign experience shows that they tend to become receptacles for those who have suffered 'inward as well as outward shipwreck,' and offer no real solution of the problem of want of employment: of relief-works by local bodies, that there is much danger

'lest they should be chiefly embraced by members of the loafing and shiftless class. . . . The work is to them merely one out of the series of casual jobs by which they are accustomed to live. When it is over they are in the same position as when it began.'

It refers to the experience of the old poor-law, and suggests that the facts are of

'more than historical interest in view of the strong tendency to experiment afresh upon the lines of former unsuccessful attempts, under the impression that an entirely new departure is being made.'

The winters from 1892-1895 were critical ones for local bodies. The 'Central Unemployed Committee' was holding daily meetings upon Tower Hill, whence deputations set out, with drums beating and banners flying, to visit vestries and Boards of Guardians. Municipal offices were at times in a state of siege. The following 'Tower Hill' handbill, which was widely distributed at the time, shows the spirit prevailing.

50,000 UNEMPLOYED WORKMEN

WANTED ON TOWER HILL.

'Fellow Unemployed,—We, the Central Unemployed Organisation Committee, are astonished at your apathy. Why not, instead of passing your time in libraries, open spaces, and parks, come to Tower Hill and show by your numbers that you are determined to ASSIST THOSE WHO ARE BATTLING FOR YOUR CAUSE. Past events have shown that it is only by force of numbers that anything can be gained by the Workers of to-day. We are prepared by energetic action to enforce your

rights. Slumber no longer, but join us in the great cry—
 “We shall not die by slow starvation. We ask but our rights
 —the right to live by useful and productive labour.”

‘Do not forget to come down, then, and bring your mates with you who are as unfortunate as yourselves; and, as we are short of funds, pass this circular on to those you know to be out of employment. Our motto is, “We will not be satisfied unless our wants are immediately recognised by the Government and the local authorities.” Workmen, assert your rights! Remember that we are fearless, and prepared for anything! Only support us by coming to Tower Hill, and if the Government refuse to accede to our demands we will lead you through the City and the West End, and let them be responsible for the consequences.

‘On behalf of the Committee,

‘CHARLES WILLIAMS, Secretary.’

In 1895 and 1896 select committees of the House of Commons took a large amount of evidence [and reported. They recommended the continuance of the policy of Mr Chamberlain’s circular, but add :—

‘The evidence shows that very considerable difficulty would be experienced if attempts were made to determine the deserts of recipients of relief by enquiry into individual cases.’ And again: ‘No well-defined meaning attaches to the expressions “exceptional distress,” “deserving man,” and ordinary claimants for parish relief. Even if it were possible to give a legislative interpretation to the same, large reliance would have to be placed upon the judgment of those investigating the cases.’

Sir Henry Fowler’s circular was not allowed to pass without protest. The Board of Works of St Saviour’s, Southwark, pointed out that,

‘Of all the classes of work above enumerated, not one can be carried out in frosty weather, which is the season in which the greatest number of men are out of employment; and also that this Board, and probably most other similar bodies, have a large number of workmen who carry on many of the works suggested above in suitable weather who will need all the employment that can be given to them when the weather breaks.

‘Secondly, much of the above work requires skilled labour, and all of it much physical effort, and is therefore totally unfit for those whose infirmities prevent their doing con-

tinuous laborious work, and who form such a large proportion of the unemployed in periods of depression.

'When this circular was first issued the Local Government Board doubtless considered that vestries and district boards could find work in the direction suggested; but very slight enquiry, at least as regards the metropolis, would have dissipated that idea long since.'

They considered the circular 'utterly futile,' and recommended its withdrawal.

After 1896 we heard little of the unemployed until 1902-3. Then there came a fresh depression, which was designated as exceptional. We have already seen that there is no definition of the term. The 'Labour Gazette' for February last points out that, though 1904 was below the average, there have been many worse years. Moreover, there has been no hard winter since 1895. Every temporary depression of trade, however, is now looked upon as exceptional. Since 1902 the agitation that prevailed in the nineties has become continuous.

In 1903-4 the Mansion House scheme was started under distinguished auspices, and was designed to tide over a period of 'exceptional distress' for people with 'established homes.' Under it selected heads of families were sent to a labour-colony, either Hadleigh or Osea island, and their families relieved meanwhile. In the same winter the Camberwell scheme was started, with a central committee, and sub-committees composed of 'councillors, guardians, and representatives of charitable bodies,' whose chief duty it was to select men for work under the Borough Council; and Mr Long put forward his scheme, which was based upon the Mansion House and Camberwell schemes, 'experiments well worth following.'

Mr Long provides for all London an organisation similar to that in Camberwell. 'The local committees will' (he says) 'easily divide applicants for work into two classes. They will use every effort to find work locally for selected men,' and, failing that, they will refer them to the central committee, which 'will in all probability require contributions from Borough Councils.'

The principles involved are therefore—(1) an undertaking of the community to find work upon the basis of the circular of 1886 and otherwise; (2) the devolution of poor relief upon Borough Councils; (3) the principle of

co-operation; (4) that of selection by enquiry; (5) that of contributions from the rates both to the central committee and locally.

With regard to some of these points, it may be said that co-operation is an admirable thing, unless it is to do something which is in itself inadmissible. Unless we are satisfied that this provision of relief-work is in itself desirable, then it is clear that co-operation will not make it so. There is danger lest the use of the words 'co-operation' and 'enquiry' should blind us to the wider issues.

Enquiry again is an excellent thing. But the basis of the Poor-law Amendment Act is that destitution is the sole claim for public relief; and the maintenance of that principle was held to be the only effective check upon pauperism. But is selection by enquiry practicable for public bodies? The committee of 1896 came to the conclusion that it is not so. The difficulty with regard to the able-bodied is exceptionally manifest. Municipal offices are apt to be surrounded by crowds of applicants, whilst the number of those selected after strict investigation would be exceedingly small. Meanwhile councillors and other members of joint committees have to appear in public, and have, somehow, to get home from the town-hall. It is no uncommon thing for the unemployed to visit the houses and places of business of their representatives to ask when their turn is coming; at all events, they are encountered daily in the streets; and finally, they have to be reckoned with as constituents at the next local election. There is even a species of unpleasantness about it to which it is hardly fair to expose those who are elected chiefly to look after our drains. Only a few days ago a borough surveyor in South London was assaulted by one of the unemployed whom he had dismissed from work.

But further, working-men themselves, who are predominant upon several of the joint committees, strongly resent enquiry. They see no reason why a man's character should depend upon the report of an employer who may be actuated by trade animus. Recently, when it was proposed, upon a certain joint committee, that enquiries should be made of employers, a labour-representative present remarked, 'I shall strongly object to that. I know what I am talking of, as I have been discharged

without a character myself; and I defy any one to prove anything against my character.' It is of course easy to see that a workman may have a legitimate grievance against his employer. The incident is mentioned to show one difficulty in a matter which appears simple. Again, it is conceivable that the unemployed themselves may be represented upon joint committees. In some places they have already been employed as 'investigators. In Bermondsey a paid organiser of the unemployed is a member of the Board of Guardians, and might at any time, therefore, become a member of the joint committee.*

Apart from special considerations of this kind, however, there is a general disinclination to incur unpopularity. But, even if there were none of these subjective difficulties, the task of ascertaining the facts about innumerable applicants is no easy one in a great city, where the conditions of labour are complex and there is a constant shift of population. In some trades men are taken on by the job. They are perhaps only known by a nickname. No character is required. The job may be a short or a long one. Or again, a man registers himself as a labourer. There are many sorts of labourers.

A man who registers himself as a cabinet-maker may be anything from an artisan to the man who pushes the barrow with the manufactured goods. There are plenty of 'small masters' who have never worked for an employer, and there are others who have worked only for some relation or for 'a mate.' References may be obtained from employers; but we know the value of written references; whereas it is physically impossible to see employers personally in every case. That these are no imaginary difficulties, every one who has had experience in the matter knows well.† Investigation in charitable relief is upon an altogether different footing. There people are dealt with in small numbers instead of in masses, and there is far more personal knowledge available. Moreover, the administrators of charitable relief are not subject to the pressure which is the universal experience of those who administer public funds. Even

* Report of the special committee of the C.O.S., 1135.

† Readers are reminded that Mr Charles Booth dismissed discrimination as impracticable in the case of the aged poor, a much smaller problem ('Aged Poor,' pp. 56-59).

in charitable relief enquiry is always unpopular, and too often inefficacious. It appears, therefore, unlikely that enquiry can be relied upon as an effective test in the public relief of the able-bodied. People cannot be divided into classes so easily as Mr Long suggests.

Shortly after the publication of his scheme a special committee of the Charity Organisation Society issued a report. The evidence, though it contains little that is new, is yet of considerable value because it brings up to date similar evidence collected for previous enquiries, the experiment of 'finding work for the unemployed' through local bodies having now had another ten years' trial. Mr Somers, the chief organiser in Camberwell of the scheme upon which Mr Long relies, is not enthusiastic about it. After a winter's trial, he says, 'the difficulty of suggesting work is what has puzzled us all through' (214). 'The work was simply created, the work was made' (205). 'Any scheme of the kind is bound to be injurious' (286).

The difficulty of finding work runs all through the evidence; and there is plenty of corroboration from other places. Since 1886 local bodies have racked their brains to devise work. In Stepney the horse sweeping-machines have been taken off in order to employ manual labour.* A councillor then suggested—no doubt sarcastically—that the water-carts might be taken off and streets watered with watering-pots. Wanstead Flats have been levelled and levelled again. All the available churchyards have been laid out, and town-halls and board-rooms painted and whitewashed again and again. So long as there has been any 'extra work' to be done, the Borough Councils have put the unemployed on to do it. Now they are obliged to put them on to their ordinary work, at a loss varying from 15 to 50 per cent.

The report shows that the conditions of municipal relief-work are unchanged. Men are still employed in short shifts. The *recidivisme* of applicants continues, and is attested, in 1905, by Mr Toynbee from Bermondsey and by Mr Rusbridge from West Ham: 'I have recognised the same old faces for years past' (1526). The Bermondsey surveyor says: 'We have 300 men every morning at the

* Since this was written the 'horse-scarifier' in Paddington has been taken off in Paddington at the instance of a deputation of the unemployed.

gate right through the year.' Labourers in the poorer districts are learning more and more every year to look to the Borough Council as the normal source of work.

Mr Lansbury's opinion is of great interest, in view of the prominent part he has taken in labour questions. He finds that the applicants for work in Poplar increase year after year (893). 'When a man comes to you once he thinks that he ought always to come' (847). 'The worst feature is that it makes them satisfied to be casual labourers' (856). Not many years ago casual labour at the Docks was in part abolished. Mr Charles Booth had stigmatised it as 'a gigantic system of outdoor relief' ('Life and Labour,' vol. i, p. 203). It is plain that the Borough Councils are taking the place of the Docks in that respect. It will be said that one object of Mr Long's scheme is to discourage this casual work. But that has not been its effect so far in most places. Local bodies are indeed 'between the devil and the deep sea.' To give continuous work to any large proportion of the applicants would spell bankruptcy, whilst selection leaves an enormous residuum at their gates dissatisfied and discontented. These men have been told officially for twenty years to go to the Borough Councils for work, and they believe that work can and should be provided.

The effect of relief-works upon mobility of labour has often been pointed out. Whilst men are waiting at municipal offices clamouring for illusory work they are in danger of falling entirely out of the ordinary labour market. Or again, there are trades which are moribund, and it is far better that men should realise the fact whilst there is time. The familiar illustration of this is derived from the watch-trade in Coventry, which came to an end some years ago owing to the introduction of cheap foreign watches. Those engaged in it suffered acutely for a time, but they are now fully occupied in the bicycle trade. If the issues had been obscured by relief-works this beneficial change would in all probability have been indefinitely postponed. Relief-works, then, chain people to a locality or a trade in which employment is admittedly not to be obtained.

The cost must be ruinous. Local bodies—some of them by no means loth—have been egged on to all kinds of expenditure. The Mayors of Lambeth and Southwar

boast that seven South London boroughs have spent this winter 52,000*l.* upon the unemployed, of which 21,000*l.* was for wages ('Times,' March 6). In one district the expenditure for extra work has quintupled itself; yet trade is no worse than it was last year. The position of Borough Councils, some of them almost bankrupt, and compelled by all sorts of pressure to employ labour they do not require, is like that of the farmers before 1834.

'It is a state of things when all is out of order. Self-preservation, that great law of nature, seems to be set at defiance. For here are farmers unable to pay men for working for them, and yet compelled to pay them for work in doing that which is really of no use to any human being.' (Cobbett, 'Rural Rides,' p. 126.)

We may ask why the unemployed should be treated as a separate class of the community at all? The only apparent answer is that they have physical and electoral force behind them. The position now is that a man, whatever his qualifications, may, by registering himself as unemployed, obtain priority over the labourer of the ordinary market. So far there is abundant evidence that the better sort of labourer does not apply. His self-respect disinclines him to mix with the motley crowd of applicants at a municipal labour-yard. If it is necessary to create work at all, it would appear to be much better that it should be done through the ordinary labour market. Napoleon III kept the workmen quiet for many years by the 'Haussmanisation' of Paris. The work came to an end in time, as all such work must; and we then saw the overthrow of the Empire and the Franco-German war. But at least the population had not lost caste in the interim, and the work was efficiently done. We may ask whether it would not have been better that the work which has been done by Borough Councils and other agencies as relief-work should have been done through the open market.

The elaborate report of the Mansion House Committee of 1904 is worth careful attention; and Mr Maynard, the hon. secretary of the fund, is to be congratulated upon it. The work of that committee was an experiment upon a small scale, conducted upon voluntary lines, with the view of helping the better class of

man out of employment, 'of tiding over a bad season and thus saving him from degradation' (p. 27). They claim, and no doubt justly, to have helped a considerable number of men of 'good industrial character' who were out of work. Still only four or five of those who were helped belonged to a friendly society or trade union; and it is clear that the higher class of labour did not avail itself of colony treatment. To the lower class of labour 'the test (that of entering an institution) was not so complete as it was expected to be.' The vital question whether those assisted are reabsorbed in the labour market cannot yet be answered.

'The dangers that attend the repetition of such a scheme may be minimised by a strict adherence to the policy adopted by the executive committee. Limitation to times of exceptional distress would avoid the evils that would follow the regular assistance to workers in seasonal trades during their normal period of temporary depression. Such assistance would be equivalent to a permanent addition to their wages at the public expense, and would remove all incentive to thrift and organisation.'

One is reluctant to say anything which might even appear to be unnecessary criticism of a scheme so carefully devised and so admirably carried out. Still there is one consideration which lies at the back of it, and which is of so much importance that it cannot be ignored. It is this. The desire of its initiators—a desire which all will share—is to help a class of working-men who are undoubtedly having a hard struggle. But these men, and perhaps others besides them, have had many such a struggle in the past; and, on the whole, as history shows, they have made steady progress in status and well-being. But if, at a critical time, when there is every temptation to find an easier way out of a difficulty, the easier way presents itself, it is certain to be taken. With the poor the temptation to abandon self-reliance is always present, and '*ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte*.' The question is one which lies deep in human nature. Dr Chalmers long ago put it very clearly:—

'It is reluctance on the part of the poor man to become a pauper which forms the mighty barrier against the extension of pauperism. . . . There is not a labourer in the country,

however well paid he may be, who might not become a pauper at the first moment of his decaying strength or of his declining wages; and that just by such a relaxation of his previous economy as could not be detected by the most watchful guardianship. . . . To relax the industry by a very little, or to let down, to a small and imperceptible extent, the economical habits . . . these are the simple expedients by which, when once the mighty hold of self-dependence is loosened, the daily increasing thousands of a city population may, in the shape of famished wives, ragged children, or destitute old men, inundate the amplest charity . . . to the full extent of its capabilities and of its funds.'

It would appear, therefore, that any measures calculated to draw down members of a class not normally dependent into the dependent class involve a grave danger.

The usual argument urged is that unemployability is the natural corollary of unemployment, and that relief of some kind is required 'to prevent further degradation.' But much stronger proof of this would have to be forthcoming in order to justify an alteration in a system of poor relief which has hitherto, by general admission, worked beneficially. It is indeed a libel upon workingmen to suggest that their moral fibre is so dependent upon physical conditions; and it would have to be plainly shown that any large proportion of the 'unemployables' have ever belonged to the genuine industrial class. A great proportion of these are still young men; and it is the fact that a vast number of boys, on leaving school, take up no trade, but become errand-boys, newspaper boys, and 'corner' boys. Again, it is only too clear that the conditions of a soldier's training have too often the effect of disqualifying him for civil life. The causes of 'unemployability' are too many to enumerate. Even if there are cases where want of employment leads to degradation, we must set off against them the far more certain degradation, proved over and over again, that results from laxity in the distribution of public relief.

Mr Percy Alden's pamphlet, 'The Unemployed: a National Question,' will no doubt have a large circulation. Mr Alden represents the frankly socialist section of those who have written upon the subject. His view is that the unemployed question is 'rooted in our social system,' and that its solution depends upon the 'recon-

struction and reorganisation of society.' He disposes in a few sentences of the 'classical economists'—to whom, by the way, he imputes, rather disingenuously, a sole desire to maintain a supply of surplus labour—and alleges that a 'more scientific' view of the problem is now becoming general. That 'more scientific' view is that the community must 'discharge its responsibility' to the unemployed by finding them work.

Criticism of details is almost superfluous when there is no possibility of agreement upon the wider question. As to that, Mr Alden is, of course, perfectly entitled to his opinion. All we can say for certain is that the numerous attempts which have been made to form communities upon the 'ethical and co-operative basis' have uniformly failed.

One cannot, however, help noticing that Mr Alden appears to attach surprisingly small importance to personal responsibility and personal character. He dismisses in a single sentence the views of the 'Atomists' that character must be a paramount consideration; and personal responsibility has no place in his economy. The 'vicious vagrant' is not responsible for his condition. 'He has been so long neglected,' and is a product of 'the sins of society.' Man is a creature of environment; which means, apparently, that if he is in comfortable circumstances he may be good, if he is not, he must be bad. Our experience of life does not, however, lead us to that conclusion. Many believe that character is formed in spite of circumstances, rather than because of them. Again, Mr Alden, except for a passing hit at 'the well-meant efforts of charitable persons,' ignores altogether the effects of relief upon character. He admits, so far as charity is concerned, the possibility of 'intensifying the evil by lessening the independence of those who receive.' As to the effects in the same direction of state action, he is silent. Mr Alden is a leader of many who have had less opportunity of studying these questions than he has had himself, and by his silence he is incurring a serious responsibility.

His 'more scientific methods' include every palliative that has been suggested either in this country or in any other, and much besides: a minister of commerce, a government department of 'unemployment,' labour

bureaux, relief-stations, as in Germany, five grades of labour-colonies, local unemployment committees, government works of afforestation and reclamation of foreshores, government purchase and improvement of canals and of the Docks and Port of London, government grants to trade-union unemployed assurance, a shorter working day—this, as a 'scientific method,' would appear to rank with the removal of horse-brooms and road scarifiers—abolition of disfranchisement for all classes of paupers. But that is not all. He would also have universal old-age pensions, state-homes for every form of disablement, etc. The book contains a preface by Sir John Gorst, who would, as we know, add to these methods the universal state-feeding of school-children. It has also apparently the general approval, subject to certain mild criticisms, of Toynbee Hall ('Toynbee Record,' February 1905).

Mr Schloss's report to the Board of Trade is issued as a supplement to that of 1893. It comes opportunely as a comment upon several of the methods advocated by Mr Alden. Twelve years' further experience of foreign labour-colonies shows that they still remain 'colonies of social wreckage, not colonies of unemployed.' They are, in fact, either open-air prisons or open-air workhouses. Their reformatory influence is admitted to be a negative quantity. He might have added that in Germany and elsewhere they have no workhouse system similar to ours. If we adopt the colony system here, we shall, in fact, be duplicating our workhouse system with very doubtful results. The experience of Germany shows that the very existence of these colonies has produced the 'Koloniebummler,' and that 75 per cent. of the colonists belong to that class ('Times,' February 11, 1905). We do not want to add the 'Koloniebummler' to our tramps and vagrants. The relief-stations, again, advocated by Mr Alden, do not appear to be an unmixed blessing. They are protected by a long list of stringent regulations, and when these are not strictly observed they 'are capable of producing anything but satisfactory results.' In Austria, for instance, a shoemaker visited in eight months 180 relief-stations.

Trade unions abroad, as in England, provide insurance against want of employment for their members, but they

do not touch the unskilled workman. Proposals have therefore been made for a national system of insurance against want of work, but, in view of 'grave difficulties,' they have come to nothing. In Cologne, St Gall, Antwerp, and other places, municipal schemes for the insurance of all classes of workmen have been instituted; but either they have failed, or where, as in Cologne, they have met their obligations, it has been 'entirely due to the very large subventions from the municipality and philanthropists.' The information in the memorandum indicates great practical difficulties of administration.

Mr Schloss also refers to labour registries, which have in Germany 'attained a marked degree of success.' He expresses no opinion as to their utility as agencies for dealing with the unemployed in this country, but he considers the foreign experience of them worthy of 'attentive consideration.' In England many localities have experimented with them; but, as a means of bringing masters and workmen together, they have hitherto failed. Whether they might be made centres of information for the better distribution of labour is a question which might well be considered.

The production of blue-books, reports, and other literature upon the unemployed has been [prodigious, and there is some danger lest, in the clash of opinions, we lose sight of the main issues. 'There is often more ado to interpret interpretations than to interpret facts.' One thing that is very clear is this, that outdoor relief to the able-bodied, precisely similar to that which existed under the old poor-law, is once more with us. Once more the pauper, for such he is, by whatever name we call him, has priority over the independent labourer. Wages are again subsidised, and people again being taught that they need make no provision. The evil is increasing, and a fresh supply of paupers is being tapped every year. Mr Long's scheme has given us a further push down the inclined plane upon which we are travelling; and it is now proposed that that scheme should be embodied in permanent legislation. It is time therefore that we should consider the position before we have definitely and openly broken with the traditions of the present poor-law.

The Board of Trade report of 1893 has pointed out

that the unemployed may be roughly divided into four classes: (1) those who are ordinarily employed, but seasonally unemployed; (2) those who are unemployed because they are 'economically superfluous'; (3) those who are so because they are 'economically worthless, or the unemployable'; (4) those who are so because of some altogether exceptional and temporary cause. It adds: 'Any hopeful solution is less a question of remedying results than of removing causes.'

As to the last class there is comparatively no difficulty. Every one recognises that, in times such as those of the Irish and Manchester famines, exceptional remedies must be applied, both by the State and philanthropy. We may yet have to face similar catastrophes, and whilst we are crying 'wolf,' the wolf may appear at the door.

It is impossible to dogmatise upon the question of 'economic superfluity' in the absence of precise information. Experience leads us to believe that the great majority of those who are supposed to be economically superfluous become absorbed in normal times in the labour market. It was so in 1834, and it has been so since upon more than one occasion when relief-works have been suddenly stopped.

With regard to those who are 'ordinarily employed, but seasonally out of work,' there can only be one real solution; and that is that they should, whilst at work, be able to command such a wage as will enable them to provide against slack times, and that they should so provide. A strong and vigorous industrial class has the power of enforcing its demands, which is denied to those who depend upon relief-works. If it is really impossible that the bulk of the labouring population should, taking good years and bad years together, live by its labour, the prospect is dark indeed. But experience affords no grounds for such pessimism. Since the restriction of relief in 1834 the bulk of the population have, in fact, lived by their labour; and moreover their accumulations in registered provident societies and in savings-banks alone are estimated at three hundred and eighty millions.*

The central difficulty is, according to the same report,

* Summary issued by Registry of Friendly Societies, 100 Wt 21976, 1/05. D & S 15, 19999.

'not so much in the existence of an unemployed class, as in the economic deterioration of the casually and insufficiently employed.' Here again we must look to prevention rather than cure. Probably every great industrial centre will always have a fringe of 'unemployables.' But whether that fringe is to be a broad one or a narrow one will rest largely with itself. Wherever the line of unemployability is fixed—and the class itself includes every grade and distinction—there must always be those just above it who are prevented from sinking to it by the stimulus of the discipline of life. Directly that stimulus is removed, the downward movement sets in, and the fringe broadens. The 'Labour Gazette' for February last shows that there were some 40,000 men upon relief-works in January, of whom 20,000 were Londoners. Alongside of this great increase of unavowed able-bodied pauperism there is also a great increase of officially recognised pauperism. Vagrancy is on the increase; and, at the same time, philanthropic agencies of all kinds, such as shelters, lodging-houses, and free meals, dealing with the same class, have multiplied to an unprecedented extent.

What is the effect of all this upon the condition of the people? Mr Lansbury says: 'I view the condition of things with a great deal of apprehension as to the future well-being of the people of London. . . . I see the work of the community being handed over to the inefficient.' His words are a lamentable commentary upon years of civic and philanthropic effort. So far that effort has spent itself chiefly in palliatives. The cry has been for relief of all kinds and in all directions. Every extension of relief has led to further extensions.

The position is, in view of political pressure, an extremely difficult one, and requires the highest courage from any statesman who may grapple with it. But it will have to be grappled with, and that mainly by preventive measures. The first condition of improvement is probably a renewed recognition of the importance of family life, because it is in the family that the unemployable is chiefly manufactured. So long as parents are told that the duty of training and supporting children lies on every one except those who bring them into the world, there will be not a few who will acquiesce. But nothing can remedy the sins of omission and commission that are found in the home.

We may perhaps improve the quality of our state education, though the teachers in a huge board-school can do little in comparison with what might be done by parents. Boys on leaving school might be apprenticed to trades or brought under the influence of the great friendly societies which have done so much to raise the standard of life amongst the industrial classes. The friendly societies might be officially recognised in connexion with the thrift-teaching of the schools and, subject to proper credentials, afforded the opportunity of recruiting there.

The conditions of a soldier's training might be altered, and he might be made a better citizen and perhaps a better soldier. Remedial measures, such as emigration and further provision for certain classes of physical disability, might be safely adopted. Co-operative small holdings, upon the lines advocated by Mr Winfrey, might do much to prevent excessive immigration into towns. Co-operation of all kinds and profit-sharing would reduce the numbers of the dependent class. At the last meeting of the South Metropolitan Gas Company it was stated that '5000, or nearly all the employés of the company had become shareholders.'

A matter of vital importance to both employers and employed, but one which is but little recognised at present by those who govern us locally, is the reduction of municipal expenditure, which is fettering the expansion of trade and permanently impairing the prosperity of the country. Employment is reduced by it, and the cost of living greatly increased. At a recent meeting in East London there was a question whether certain ground should be built upon or kept as an open space. A working-man present expressed the opinion that it would be better to keep it as an open space because, if a certain class of house-property were built upon it, it would cost in rates more than it produced. At the last annual meeting of the Great Eastern Railway the chairman pointed out that the rates had increased by 20,000*l.* in a single year. Better industrial organisation might prevent excessive oscillations and bring about a better distribution of labour and improved relations between it and capital.

To conclude, the unemployed question is only part of a

much wider one; and, if we are really to improve the conditions with regard to it, we must submit to learn how to do so. 'It is time for us to stop bragging and to apply ourselves humbly to the science and art of administration.' Modern philanthropy declines to accept past experience. What has been done in the past has failed 'because it has been done in the wrong way,' or 'circumstances have changed and the old evils would not recur.' Parliamentary committees recommend 'fresh experiments'; and on all sides there is a demand for 'wise experiments.'

But to repeat past failures under the guise of experiments is suicidal. Whatever else has changed, human nature has not done so, but will always follow the line of least resistance by a law as sure as the law of gravitation. We need not go to the past for our experience. Wherever we have the old conditions we find the old results. In West Ham and Poplar, where Mr Alden's doctrines have prevailed, we find the same conditions as those under the old poor-law. In Poplar one in every fifteen of the population is a pauper.

This refusal to accept experience finds its chief support in the species of agnosticism adopted towards social questions by the leaders of scientific thought to whom the public looks for guidance. We have not, they say, sufficient data to prove the existence of social science. Professor Henderson, whose comprehensive survey of 'modern methods of charity' in all civilised countries has just been published, is of the contrary opinion. He is in agreement with those who have made a special study of these questions in this country, and who have long been of opinion that, as in the last thirty years or more the facts and statistics of poor relief have been more and more carefully recorded and collated, a new science of applied sociology has gradually revealed itself. Professor Henderson's enquiry is cosmopolitan. He says of it:

'The ultimate object of the entire investigation is the foundation of principles for the guidance of conduct. . . . The phenomena here placed in order for comparison reveal certain tendencies of expert judgment which, within the limits of our conditions, are reliable and authoritative. If the metaphysician scorns these judgments as lacking in the sublime qualities of eternity, universality, and absoluteness, we can

at least affirm that they are useful and necessary, even morally obligatory, in our times. . . . In all civilised countries which have become rich enough to afford the luxury, a dependent group appears. When the domestic group no longer suffices for support, and slavery or serfdom has been abolished, the liberated labourer becomes free to be a pauper.' ('Modern Methods of Charity,' pp. ix, x.)

The problem then is how to counteract this tendency; and the conclusion is that it can be done by 'preventive and prophylactic' methods only. If we recognise the existence of social science, the problem of the future is how best to spread it among the people. 'The education of the benevolent public will be one of the most important factors.' The millionaire who would found a chair of social science at one of the universities might do more to cure poverty than by giving all his property for the relief of the poor.

We have, however, to be on our guard against accepting as scientific everything that 'comes from abroad.' Many things that are practicable and even scientific where there is universal military service and every one is 'pigeon-holed,' would not be so here. But even abroad there is already a reaction against many of the methods adopted there; and eminent men, such as Dr Aschrott, are warm advocates of our system of poor relief in preference to their own. 'There is a growing feeling in Germany in favour of restricting public relief to such institutions as the workhouses.'

Academic sociology has hitherto confined itself chiefly to speculations as to the conditions existing amongst prehistoric man. It is time that we should bring it up to date. Is it vain to hope that these questions may be some day removed from the arena of politics and treated seriously by all patriotic citizens upon a rational and judicial basis?

NOTE ON THE SUGAR CONVENTION.

In an incidental reference to the Sugar Convention in the 'Quarterly Review' for January last (p. 259), it was remarked that, 'owing to the Sugar Convention, Swiss manufacturers are able to buy sugar at less than half the price that British makers have to pay.' This statement was made on the authority of a letter from Messrs Icke and Sharp, of Birmingham, to Mr Chamberlain, and not challenged by him. Messrs Icke and Sharp may be able to substantiate their assertion. We cannot. What our enquiries show is that on July 1, 1904, the price of Austrian white granulated crystal sugar at Zurich was 10s. 4½d., and on October 1, 12s. 6d., per cwt.; that, allowing 1s. per cwt. for cost of transit from Hamburg to London and landing expenses there, the cost of granulated German sugar in London was 12s. 2½d. and 14s. per cwt. on the same dates respectively; and that on the same dates respectively the prices of German sugar at Zurich were 11s. 11d. and 14s., and of French, 10s. 11d. and 15s. 3d. Russian sugar at Zurich may have been cheaper; but, as 55 per cent. of the sugar consumed in Switzerland is from Austria, 25 per cent. from Germany, 18 per cent. from France, and only 2 per cent. from Russia and all other countries, the price of odd lots of Russian sugar is scarcely to be taken into account. To the extent of 55 per cent. of its sugar, then, Switzerland, on the dates named, had an advantage of from 1s. 6d. to 1s. 9½d. per cwt. over London, while on German sugar the advantage on July 1 was 3½d. per cwt., and on October 1 the prices were equal.

Corrigendum.—In the same article, p. 252, line 2 from foot, for 'foods' read 'goods.'

INDEX

TO THE

TWO HUNDRED AND SECOND VOLUME OF THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of articles are printed in italics.]

A.

Acton, Lord, 'Cambridge Modern History' planned by, 97.

Ainger, Canon, 169—his lofty religious standard, *ib.*—character of his mouth, 170—gift of moral criticism, 170, 187—his choice of a profession, 171—unchangeableness, *ib.*—love of music, 172—conservatism, 173—appearance, *ib.*—his genius for acting, 174—readings in public and in private, 175, 190—Reader at the Temple, 176—his wit, 177—179—characteristics, 179—power over quotations, *ib.*—his verses, 180, 183—187—friendship with Du Maurier, 181—his genius for friendship, 182—death of his sister, *ib.*—of his friend Mrs Haslehurst, 183—lectures on Shakespeare, 188—190—his translations, 191—friendships in literature, *ib.*—biography of Lamb, 192—his sermons, *ib.*—religious views, 193—195—spiritual humility, 195—charm as a preacher, *ib.*

Alden, Mr Percy, 'The Unemployed: a National Question' criticised, 637 *et seq.*

Arnold, Matthew, his essay on 'The Function of Criticism at the Present Time,' 197—'French Eton,' 205, 235.

Arnold, Matthew, 221—biographical sketches, 222—his father, 223—influences of his childhood, 224—contemporaries, 225—life at Oxford, 226—private Secretary to Lord Lansdowne, 228—withdraws his first book of poems, *ib.*—character, 229—invincible *insouciance*, 230—his ideal, *ib.*—double nature, 231—criticism of himself, 232, 238—marriage, 233—school inspector, *ib.*—services to education, 235, 246—prejudice against the Nonconformists, *ib.*—elected to the professorship of Poetry at Oxford, 236—'Merope,' *ib.*—'New Poems,' 237—political views, 239—view of natural science, 241—his poems, 242—prose contributions, 242, 243—character of his writings, 244, 248—advocacy of a British academy, 245—lack of concentration, 248.

Ashley, Percy, 'Modern Tariff History,' 265, 266, 270.

Ashley, W. J., 'The Progress of the German Working Classes,' 265, 272.

Australia and the policy of Preference, 565—580.

B.

Balfour, Rt Hon. A. J., M.P., definition of his protective policy, 252—view of Retaliation, 254—his speech

- at Edinburgh, 311—opposition to a protective policy, *ib.* See Prime Minister.
- Baltic fleet and the Dogger Bank incident, 296, 314.
- Bancroft, George, 'History of the United States,' 91.
- Bérard, M. Victor, his 'Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée,' 344 *et seq.*
- Bismarck, Prince, his policy of Protection, 268.
- Bredt, Dr F. W., on the care of monuments, 504-506.
- Byron, The Collected Works of Lord, 429—his complex individuality, *ib.*—as letter-writer, 430—pains of composition and revision, 434-437—occasional faultiness of rhythm, 437—indebtedness to books, 437 *et seq.*—originals of his heroes, 438—influence of Mrs Radcliffe, 439—Don Juan derived from Casti, 441—appropriation from the ancients, 442—from the moderns, 443—instances of unconscious plagiarism, 444-446—his 'Titanism,' 447—rhetoric and falsetto, *ib.*—contrast with Wordsworth, 448—views of the plastic arts, 449—'Manfred' contrasted with 'The Vision of Judgment,' 450, 451—his versatility, 451—range of composition, 452—'Childe Harold' and 'Don Juan' valued, 453-455—lack of certain essentials, 455—defects as an artist, 456—continental opinion of Byron, 456—his place among poets, 457.
- C.
- 'Cambridge Modern History,' 97.
- Canada and the policy of Preference, 546-565.
- Care of the Insane, The, 399. See Insane.
- Carlile, W. W., 'Economic Method and Economic Fallacies,' 258.
- Carson, H. L., 'The Supreme Court of the United States,' 121.
- Carter, R. Brudenell, his 'Doctors and their Work' quoted, 426.
- Chamberlain, Rt Hon. A., M.P., his criticism on Free Trade, 319.
- Chamberlain, Rt Hon. J., M.P., his propositions on his fiscal policy, 256-258—on the result of the Sugar Convention, 258—on agriculture, 259—on the increase of small holders of land, 263—his Commission of enquiry, 274—speech at Luton, 313—his circular to Boards of Guardians *re* relief of the unemployed, 627.
- Chapman, S. J., 'Work and Wages,' 274-276.
- Churchmen, Two Great, 458. See Creighton and *see* Liddon.
- Coleridge, Ernest H., as editor of 'The Works of Lord Byron,' 432 *et seq.*
- Colonial View of Preference, 546. See Preference.
- Corbett, Julian S., 'Drake and the Tudor Navy,' 151, 156—'Successors of Drake,' 157, 165, *note*—'England in the Mediterranean,' 167, *note*.
- County Council, London, work of the, on education, 207.
- Cowper, William, and Horace Walpole, 35. See Walpole.
- Creighton, Bishop Mandell, compared with Liddon, 458—his great intellectual power, 461—paradox and flippancy, 462—what they hid, 463—early resolve to take orders, 465—ideas of duty, *ib.*—his conception of religion, 466—progress and divine government, 467—object in taking orders, 468—his use of influence, 469—letters to his wife, 470—two stages in his spiritual development, 471—indebtedness to Goethe, 472—the application of law to morals, 473-475—absolute confidence in the Christian faith, 475—powers in conversation, 476—his genius for affairs, 477—as tutor and clergyman, *ib.*—devotion to service, 478—as student and man of action, 479—as bishop and historian, 480—his philosophy of history, 481—wise treatment of the Kensit trouble, 482—answer to Sir William Harcourt, 483—why the world misunderstood, 484.

Creighton, Mrs, her success as her husband's biographer, 480.
Crystal Palace District Gas Company, system of profit-sharing, 70.
Cunningham, W., 'The Rise and Decline of the Free-trade Movement,' 269.

D.

Dawson, W. H., on the cult of Matthew Arnold, 245—'Protection in Germany,' 267, 270-272.
Deakin, Mr, on the attitude of Australia *re* Preference, 565, 567, 571.
Denmark, result of co-operation, 79.
Devonshire, Mrs R. L., her translation of the 'Life and Letters of H. Taine,' 371.
Dill, Samuel, 'Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius,' 540 *et seq.*
Dodwell, H. Herbert, 'Hippolyte Taine, Philosopher and Critic,' 371.
Dogger Bank incident, 296, 314.
Dubois, Professor, his study of the origin of pearls, 490.
Duckling 'ranch,' success of a, 143.
Dufferin, Lord, 321—birth and ancestry, 322—his mother, 323—at Eton, *ib.*—and Oxford, 324—present at the siege of Bomarsund, *ib.*—accompanies Lord John Russell to Vienna, 325—'Letters from High Latitudes,' *ib.*—called to the Levant, *ib.*—the joint commission to Syria, 326—French and English differences of opinion, *ib.*—personal success, 327—Under-Secretary at the India Office, 328—death of his mother, *ib.*—marriage, *ib.*—at the War Office, *ib.*—intervenes in the Irish Land controversy, *ib.*—as Irish landlord, 329—Governor-General of Canada, 330—questions in Canada, *ib.*—his work and influence there, 331—making the Canadians imperial, 332—at St Petersburg, *ib.*—violence in Russia, 333—transferred to Constantinople, *ib.*—work in Egypt, 334—representative institutions founded, *ib.*—his report, 335—Viceroy of India, 336

—foreign policy of the Indian Empire, 337 *et seq.*—relations with Afghanistan, *ib.*—the Panjdeh incident, *ib.*—Burma, 339, 340—created marquis, 340—last years, 341—characteristics and qualities, 341-343.

E.

East, the Far, War in, 280. *See* War.
'Edinburgh Review,' Sydney Smith's articles on the reform of madhouses, 406.
Education, The Direction and Method of, 197—epoch of expansion, 198—reform of educational machinery, 200—of method, *ib.*—appointment of Mr Morant, 201—aim of legislation, 202—Act of 1899; 203—work of the Board, 204—Act of 1902; 205, 207—abolition of School Boards, 206—the County Council, 207—problems of the teacher and the child, 209—object of state intervention, 210—the new 'Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools,' 211—differentiation of function, 212—'Regulations for Secondary Schools,' 213—'for the Training of Teachers,' *ib.*—work of the education committees, 216-219—scheme of county scholarships, 216—inadequate supply of trained teachers, 217.
Eggs, production of, 136—price, *ib.*—number imported, 139—new-laid, *ib.*
Evans, A. J., his discoveries in Crete, 353.

F.

Fielding, the Hon. W. S., on the policy of Canada in regard to Preference, 555.
Fisher, Sydney G., 'True History of the American Revolution,' 102—'Evolution of the Constitution of the United States,' 117.
Fiske, John, 'New France and New

- England,' 93—his 'Essays Historical and Literary,' 94.
 Fortescue, Hon. J. W., 'History of the British Army,' 160, *note*.
 France, percentage of unemployed, 262—effect of a peasant proprietary, 264—result of Protection, 266.
 Free Trade, influence of, 261.
 Fry, Roger E., 'Watts and Whistler,' 607.

G.

- Gasworks Company, South Metropolitan, profit-sharing at, 64-70.
 Germany, result of Protection, 267.
 Giraud, M., his judgment of Taine's habit of thought, 388.
 Gladstone, W. E., on Bishop Stubbs's 'Lectures,' 7—on Matthew Arnold's style of writing, 244.
 Gneist compared with Stubbs, 28.
 Godin, J. B. A., founder of the iron-works at Guise, 70—his copartnership scheme, 71-74.
 Goethe, lines from, 248—his influence on Bishop Creighton, 472.
 Gordon, R., draws the attention of Parliament to the state of pauper lunatics, 408.

H.

- Hakluyt, Richard, 'The Principall Navigations,' 146.
 Hardy, Thomas, description of a tithe-barn, 500.
 Hart, Albert Bushnell, 'The Formation of the Union, 1750-1829'; 92—'The Foundations of American Foreign Policy,' 113.
 Hatch, Ernest, M.P., on the circular of the Gorton election, 315.
 Henderson, B. W., 'The Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero,' 540.
 Herdman, Professor, report of, on the Ceylon pearl fisheries, 493.
 Hereford, Bishop of, on Matthew Arnold's views on education, 246.
 Hildreth, R., 'History of the United States,' 91.

- Holmes, T. Rice, 'Cæsar's Conquest of Gaul' reviewed, 523.
 'Home-Counties,' 'Poultry-keeping as a Business,' 125.
 Howard, John, and the treatment of the insane, 405.
 Hutton, W. H., 'Letters of William Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford,' edited by, 1.

I.

- Impressionists, the French, 607, 614.
 Insane, The Care of the, 399—the Lord Chancellor the head of the Board of Lunacy, *ib.*—'Prærogativa Regis,' 399-401—the King's charge of idiots, 400—medieval treatment of maniacs, 401-403—good work of the religious orders, 402—'Bedlam,' 403—private homes in the eighteenth century, 404—want of legal control, *ib.*—St Luke's Hospital, *ib.*—cruelties practised on the insane poor, 405, 407—John Howard and Samuel Tuke, *ib.*—Sydney Smith's opinion of Tuke's 'York Retreat,' 406—efforts of Parliament, 406 *et seq.*—the report of 1815; 407—abolition of severe restraint, *ib.*—position of the College of Physicians, 408—numbers and condition of the pauper insane, *ib.*—consequences of the report of 1844; 409—'the Magna Charta of the insane,' *ib.*—report of 1877, *ib.*—Consolidation Act of 1890; 410—present-day supervision of the pauper insane, 411-414—need for more Commissioners, 412—constitution of the Commission, 413—the legal element, 414-417—arrangements in Scotland, 417, 423—supervision of lunatics possessing means, 418, 419—possible amalgamation of the two departments, 420—financial position, *ib.*—semi-public hospitals, 421—treatment of persons with incipient insanity, 422—need for modifying the lunacy law, 424—the medical officer of health, 425—example of a bad private asylum, 426—need for reform, 428.

Ireland, economic condition, 74—
organisation of creameries, 78—
establishment of Raiffeisen banks,
80—number of federations, 81—
Land Act of 1903; 82.

J.

Jameson, Mr Lyster, his researches
into the causes of the formation of
pearls, 488-490.

Japan, war with Russia, 282. *See*
War.

Johnston, Rev. J. D., his 'Life and
Letters of Henry Parry Liddon' re-
viewed, 458-461.

Jowett, Professor, on Matthew Ar-
nold's style of writing, 244.

K.

Kelaart, Dr, his report on the Ceylon
pearl-oyster fishery, 487.

King, Rev. J., protests against van-
dalism at Berwick-on-Tweed, 498.

L.

Lansbury, Mr, on the effects of muni-
cipal relief on the unemployed, 634.

Larned, Professor J. N., 'Literature
of American History,' edited by,
90.

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, on the tariff
policy of Canada, 556.

Lee, Guy C., 'True History of the
Civil War,' 119.

Liddon, Henry Parry, compared with
Bishop Creighton, 458—his position
in the Church, 459—defects of the
perfect priest, 461.

List, Friedrich, his advocacy of 'na-
tionality,' 255.

Livesey, Sir George, his system of
profit-sharing, 64—speech at the
Crystal Palace, 67.

Long, the Rt Hon. W. H., his scheme
for relief of the unemployed, 630
et seq.

Lyall, Sir Alfred, as Lord Dufferin's
biographer, 321.

M.

Maurier, G. Du, his friendship with
Canon Ainger, 181.

McKinley, W., 'The Tariff,' 269, 271.

Meredith, H. O., 'Protection in
France,' 262.

Monuments, Our Neglected, 497

—historic remains at Berwick-on-
Tweed, *ib.*—injured or destroyed,
498—remains at Newcastle-on-
Tyne, 499—tithe-barn at Peter-
borough, 500—destroyed, 501—the
Whitgift Hospital at Croydon, *ib.*
—threatened, 502—how foreign
countries regard their ancient
monuments, *ib.*—present machin-
ery for preserving them, 503—
public opinion the eventual arbiter,
504—care of monuments in Ger-
many, 505—the official machinery,
506—the Austrian Commission, *ib.*
—the French, 506-508—Italy and
Germany, 508-510—other countries,
510—foreign legislative enact-
ments, 510-514—compared with
British, 514-516—the London
County Council inventory, 517—
call for a royal commission, 517-
519—case of Penrith, 518—a per-
missive Act, 519—what the Gov-
ernment might do, 520.

Morant, Mr, his appointment on the
Board of Education, 201.

Morley, Rt Hon. J., M.P., on Matthew
Arnold, 246.

Moseley, Sir Alfred, his Industrial
Report, 62, 84.

Murray, Gilbert, 'The Wanderings
of Odysseus,' 344.

Myres, J. L., his discoveries in
Cyprus, 353.

N.

Navy, The Tudors and the, 145.
See Tudors.

Navy Records Society, works of the,
146.

Newport, Mr, 'Paying Poultry,' 140.

Nicholson, J. S., 'History of the
English Corn Laws,' 260.

Noailles, Vicomte de, 'Marins et
Soldats français en Amérique,' 110.

O.

Odysseus, The Wanderings of, 344—M. Bérard's theory, *ib.*—the 'Odyssey' one of the 'Nostoi,' 345—a 'Mediterranean Pilot,' *ib.*—topology, 346—the position of Mycenæ, *ib.*—'la loi des Isthmes,' 347—the case of Troy, 348—Homeric ships starting in the night, 349—'La Course,' 350—Lampeduza and Delos, 351—uncertainty of M. Bérard's theory of Phœnician influence, *ib.*—the Mediterranean never possessed by one Power, 352—the evidence of Crete, 353—and Cyprus, *ib.*—of Palestine and Egypt, 354—the sea-power of Phœnicia, *ib.*—Greek words of Phœnician origin, 355—'systems of doublets,' 356—359—chronology, 360—362—difficulties in the conception, *ib.*—references to Phœnicians in Homer, 361—the Spring of the Bear, 363—365—Porto Pozzo, 365—the Doves' Rock, 366—the harpooning of Achæans, 367—the pierced rock, 368—examination of the theories, 368—370.

Oppenheim, M., 'History of the Administration of the Royal Navy,' 152—his introduction to Monson's 'Naval Tracts,' 153, *note*, 157.

Our Neglected Monuments, 497—*See* Monuments.

P.

Palmer, Walter, 'Poultry Management on a Farm,' 139.

Pater, Walter, on the tendency of education, 220.

Paul, H. W., 'Matthew Arnold,' 222.

Pearls and Parasites, 485—cause of the formation of pearls, *ib.*—constitution of the oyster-shell, *ib.*

—process of the formation, 486—

—Dr Kelaart's report, 487—Scotch and British pearls, 488—cause of pearls in the edible mussel, *ib.*—

—Mr Jameson's researches, 488—490

—and those of Professor Dubois, 490—ancient Cingalese pearl fisheries, 491—dates of recent fisheries, *ib.*—how the oysters are obtained and sold, 492, 493—a report by experts, 493—chief causes of failure, 494—life-history of the parasite not yet ascertained, 495—present investigations, 496—last year's fishery, *ib.*

Pelham, H. F., 'The Early Roman Emperors,' 521.

Plunkett, Sir Horace, 'Ireland in the New Century,' 75.

Port Arthur, siege of, 293—surrender, 295.

Poultry-keeping as a Business,

125—hens kept by a cottager, 127

—a suburban kitchen-garden, 128

—poultry-farms, 128—131—breeding

of show-birds, 132—merits of utility

poultry, 134—invention of the trap

register or recording-nest, 136—

price of eggs, *ib.*—management on

farms, 137—advantages to farmers,

138—profitable feeding, *ib.*—

amount of eggs and poultry im-

ported, 139—'new-laid' eggs, *ib.*—

supply of English, 140—American

'poultry-plants,' 142—duckling

'ranch,' 143.

Pratt, E. A., 'The Organisation of Agriculture,' 264.

Preference: the Colonial View,

546. I. CANADA, *ib.*—the idea of

Protection before 1847; 547—the

first protective tariff, *ib.*—Mr Glad-

stone's remonstrance, 548—Recipro-

city treaty with the United States,

549—the tariff of 1858; 550—pro-

test of Mr Galt against home

interference, *ib.*—general tariff

policy till to-day, 550, 551—the

'offer,' 551—percentage of duty on

dutiable imports, 552—resolutions

of colonial conferences, 553—failure

of the movement for Preference in

Canada, 554—waiting for England

to move, 555 *et seq.*—resolution of

the Chambers of Commerce of the

Empire, 559—statistics, 560—di-

lemma of Preferentialists at home,

562—the question of continuity, 563—consequences of alterations of the tariff, 564—summary of effects, *ib.* II. AUSTRALIA, 565—attitude of leaders and parties, 565, 566—resolutions, 568—defeat of the principle of Preference, 569—relations with India, 572—apathy in Australia, 572-574—various definitions of Preference, 575—the Press generally hostile, 578—the Labour party, *ib.*—Australia and Imperial defence, 580.

Prime Minister's Duty, 309—concentration of the Opposition on the fiscal issue, 310—Mr Balfour's speech at Edinburgh, 311—his opposition to a protective policy, *ib.*—advocacy of an Imperial conference, 312—declaration of policy, *ib.*—Mr Chamberlain's speech at Luton, 313—Anglo-Russian crisis, 314—circular on the Gorton election, 316—aggressive attitude of free-trade Unionists, *ib.*—voting in favour of Liberal candidates, 317—proposed temporary alliance, *ib.*—Mr Balfour's policy of consideration, 318—need for a definite statement, 319.

Profit-sharing and Copartnership, 61—spirit of trade-unionism, 62—losses to the national productive power, *ib.*—joint-stock principle, 63—system of the South Metropolitan Gasworks Company, 64-70—Crystal Palace District Gas Company, 70—M. Godin's scheme, 70-74—economic condition of Ireland, 74—Sir H. Plunkett's work on, 75-78—organisation of the creameries, 78—establishment of Raiffeisen banks, 80—number of federations, 81—Land Act of 1903; 82—adaptability of co-operation, 83—'premium' system, 84-87.

Protection, policy of, 252.

Prothero, Rowland E., 'Horace Walpole and William Cowper,' 35—editor of 'The Letters of Lord Byron,' 430-432.

R.

Reid, Mr, on Preference, 569.

Retaliation, policy of, 254.

Roman Emperors, The Early, 521—tendency for ancient history to become impersonal, *ib.*—Momm- sen's influence, *ib.*—interest in the history of individuals reviving, 522—progress of investigation, 523—Julius Cæsar, 523-526—Augustus, 527-531—Tacitus as historian of the Cæsars, 531-533—Tiberius, 533-535—Gaius or Caligula, 535—Claudius, 536-540—Nero, 540-542—authority of the Cæsars, 542—Seneca, 543-545.

Russell, G. W. E., 'Matthew Arnold,' 222.

Russia, The Condition of, 581—revolution or restlessness? *ib.*—the Western mind and Russia, 582—the autocracy, 583—the December ukase of the Tsar, 584—Prince Mirsky's régime, *ib.*—the Press, 585—appeal of the intellectuals, 586—the autocracy obstinate, *ib.*—effect of the Japanese successes, 587—desperate condition of the peasants, 587-589—their wrath smouldering, 589—forces of revolution, 590—the murder of Plehve, *ib.*—the massacre at Baku, 591—widespread government cruelties, 593—possibilities of outbreak in the Caucasus, 594-597—the Armenians, 595—the Polish movement, 597-599—the labour movement, 599 *et seq.*—the St Petersburg massacre, 600—the strike, 601—demand for responsible government, 604—position of the Tsar, 606.

Russia, war with Japan, 282. *See* War.

S.

Sadler, Professor M. E., his 'Report on Secondary Education in Liverpool,' 201, 210, 218.

Sainte-Beuve, his relations with Taine, 387, 394, 397.

Saintsbury, George, 'Matthew Arnold,' 222.
 Schools, Board, abolition of, 206—
 'Elementary, Code of Regulations,'
 211—'Secondary, Regulations for,'
 213.
 Scott, Frank J., 'Portraits of
 Julius Cæsar,' 523.
 Shaftesbury, Earl of (Lord Ashley),
 secures 'the Magna Charta of the
 insane,' 409.
 Shakespeare, Canon Ainger's read-
 ings of, 175, 188-190.
 Shipley, A. E., 'Pearls and Para-
 sites,' 485.
 Shuckburgh, E. S., his 'Augustus'
 criticised, 528-530.
 Sichel, Edith, 'Canon Ainger,' 169,
 Sidgwick, Professor, his criticism on
 'In Memoriam,' 240.
 Smith, Sydney, articles in the 'Edin-
 burgh Review' on the condition of
 the insane, 406, 407.
 Stubbs, William, Churchman and
 Historian, 1—his characteristics,
 2, 3, 10—ordination, 4—'Regis-
 trum Sacrum Anglicanum,' *ib.*—
 appointed librarian at Lambeth,
ib.—professor of Modern History
 at Oxford, 5—'Constitutional His-
 tory,' *ib.*—political views, 6—power
 of concentration, *ib.*—'Select
 Statutes,' 7—on the Royal Com-
 mission of enquiry into the Eccle-
 siastical Courts, 7-9—Bishop of
 Chester, 9—religious views, 10—
 apparent want of sympathy, 11—
 assessor in the Bishop of Lincoln's
 case, *ib.*—on the 'joint action of
 Convocations,' 12—character of his
 preaching, 14—attitude towards
 Biblical research, 15—on the danger
 of disestablishment, 16—his dis-
 trust of public opinion, *ib.*—char-
 acter of his writings, 18-22, 33—
 distrust of generalisations, 20—
 constructive character of his work,
 21—his prefaces, 23—lack of artistic
 power, *ib.*—estimates of character,
 23—his study of constitutional de-
 velopment, 24-28—compared with
 Waltz and Gneist, 28—'Lectures
 on European History,' 29, 33—

'Medieval and Modern History,' 29
 —his qualities of criticism, 29-31—
 Teutonic impulses, 31—predilec-
 tion for periods, 32.

T.

Taine, Hippolyte, Philosopher
 and Critic, 371—his intellect and
 ideals, *ib.*—birth, 372—school-life,
 373—search for general truths, 374
 —admitted to L'École Normale, *ib.*
 —application for the *agrégation* in
 philosophy refused, 375—professor
 of philosophy at Nevers, 376—his
 thesis on sensations, *ib.*—disgusted
 by the *coup d'état* and self-seeking
 politicians, 376, 377—professor of
 rhetoric at Poitiers, 377—relations
 with Napoleon III, 378—depression
 of spirits, 379—academic honours,
ib.—'Voyage aux Eaux des Pyré-
 nées, 380—attempts to secure the
 Academy prize, 380, 381—'Philo-
 sophes Classiques,' 381—'History
 of English Literature,' 382, 395—
 impressions of England, 383-385—
 'Étienne Mayran,' 385—visit to
 Italy, 386—professor of aesthetics,
ib.—'De l'Intelligence,' 387—his
 pessimism, 388—'Origines de la
 France Contemporaine,' *ib.*—his
 metaphysical position, 389—as
 philosopher and psychologist, 390-
 395—his criticism of English
 writers, 396 *et seq.*—present value
 of his conclusions, 398.

Tariffs and National Well-being,
 250—works on, 251—Mr Balfour's
 definition of his protective policy,
 252—his view of Retaliation and
 Preference, 254—List's advocacy of
 'nationality,' 255—Mr Chamber-
 lain's propositions, 257—result of
 the Sugar Convention, 258—agri-
 culture, 259—influences of Free
 Trade, 261—percentage of unem-
 ployed in France, 262—effect of a
 peasant proprietary, 264—result of
 protection in France, 266—Ger-
 many, 267-271—America, 269, 271
 —Mr Chamberlain's Commission
 of enquiry into fiscal conditions,
 274—Professor Chapman's 'Work

and Wages,' 274-276—note and corrigendum, 646.

'Teachers, Regulations for the Training of,' 213.

Toynbee, Mrs Paget, 'The Letters of Horace Walpole,' edited by, 36.

Trade-unionism, spirit of, 62.

Trevelyan, Sir George, 'The American Revolution,' 109.

Tudors, The, and the Navy, 145—works published by the Navy Records Society, 146—Hakluyt's 'Principall Navigations,' 146-148—maritime character of the Tudor period, 148—establishment of the Navy Board in 1548; 150—development of the sailing-ship, 151—M. Oppenheim's 'History of the Administration of the Royal Navy,' 152—achievements of Henry VIII, *ib.*—the warship, 153—during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, 154—war with Spain, 156—its two aspects, 157—the 'Counter-Armada,' 159—causes of the failure, 160—the 'Flota' policy, 161—policy of Queen Elizabeth, 163-166—of James I, 167—Charles I, 168.

Tuke, Samuel, founds 'York Retreat' for the insane poor, 405.

Two Great Churchmen, 458. See Creighton and *see* Liddon.

Tyne, C. H. Van, 'The Loyalists in the American Revolution,' 105.

U.

Unemployed, The, 624—the promise of legislation, *ib.*—history of the poor-law, 625—the Poor-law Amendment Act, 626—Mr Chamberlain's circular to Boards of Guardians, 627—and Sir Henry Fowler's, *ib.*—meetings on Tower Hill, 628—recommendations of select committees, 629—the Mansion House scheme, 630—and that of Mr Long, *ib.*—difficulties of selection and enquiry, 631—of providing work, 633—*recidivisme* of applicants, *ib.*—casual labour, 634—effect of relief-works, *ib.*—the cost, *ib.*—report of the Mansion House

Committee, 635—'unemployables,' 637—methods of treatment, 638-640—the progress of pauperisation, 640, 644—four classes of unemployed, 641—ways of improvement, 643—the need of social science, 645.

Unionist free-traders, proposed temporary alliance with the Liberal party, 317.

United States, the premium system of paying wages, 84.

United States, The Making of the, 83—Professor Larned's 'Literature of American History,' 90—G. Bancroft's 'History of the United States,' 91—R. Hildreth's history, *ib.*—A. B. Hart's 'The Formation of the Union, 1750-1829'; 92—J. Flake's 'New France and New England,' 93—Professor W. Wilson's 'History of the American People,' 94-97—'Cambridge Modern History,' 97-102, 115—S. Fisher's 'True History of the American Revolution,' 102-104—C. H. Van Tyne's 'The Loyalists in the American Revolution,' 104-107—Sir G. Trevelyan's 'American Revolution,' 107-110—Vicomte de Noaille's history, 110-112—A. B. Hart's 'Foundations of American Foreign Policy,' 113—S. Fisher's 'Evolution of the Constitution of the United States,' 117-119—G. C. Lee's 'True History of the Civil War,' 119—H. L. Carson's 'Supreme Court of the United States,' 121—'poultry-plants,' 142—result of Protection, 271.

W.

Wages, the premium system of paying, 84.

Waltz, compared with Dr Stubbs, 28.

Walpole, Horace, and William Cowper, 35—character of their letters, 35-38—tastes in common, 38—love of animals, 39—of gardening, 40—dogs, *ib.*—literature, 40-42—dissimilarity of their outward circumstances, 43-49—their pictures of clerical life, 49—comparison

- between a picnic at Olney and Vauxhall, 50-52—changes in town and country life, 52-56—views on Methodism, 56—political views, 57—patriotism, 59.
- War, The, in the Far East, 280—**commencement of hostilities between Japan and Russia, 282—first successes of Japan, *ib.*—unpreparedness of Russia, 284—operations, 286—condition of the railway, 287—battles of Liaoyang and Shaho, 288-292—siege of Port Arthur, 293-295—surrender, 295—destruction of the Pacific squadron, 296—the Dogger Bank incident, 296-299—lessons taught by the war, 299-305—issues of the campaign, 305-308—voyage of the Baltic fleet, 307.
- Ward, Humphry, his 'British Poets,' 240.**
- Warren, T. Herbert, 'Matthew Arnold,' 221.**
- Watson, Mr J. C., views on Preference, 566.**
- Watson, William, 'In Laleham Churchyard,' 248.**
- Watts and Whistler, 607—likeness and unlikeness, 608—Whistler's personality, *ib.*—his love of real beauty, 609—the Nocturnes, 610—his creed as an artist, 610 *et seq.*—the quest of Oriental beauty, 612—the portraits of Carlyle and his mother, 613—occasional triviality, 614—his heroic isolation, *ib.*—Watts a contrast to Whistler, *ib.*—greatness of his ideas and aims, 615—effect of the age, 616—the health of his creed, 618—his symbolism and allegories, 619—interpretations of classical mythology, 620—national designs, *ib.*—portraits, *ib.*—a landscape painter, 621—his place among artists, 622.**
- Whistler as artist, 607-614.**
- Willrich, Herr H., his study of Caligula, 535.**
- Wilson, Professor Woodrow, 'History of the American People,' 94.**
- Wright, Lewis, 'The New Book of Poultry,' 131, 137.**
- Wright, Thomas, 'The Correspondence of William Cowper,' arranged by, 36.**

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SECOND VOLUME.

near
er's
real
0-
7-
2-
his
ity,
-
ib
ma,
the
ym-
ter
ogy
por
621

r of
His
4.
k of
ond
nged